A

PAPIST

Mis-represented and Represented:

OR, A

Twofold Character of POPERY.

THE ONE

Containing a Sum of the Superstitions, Idolatries, Cruelties, Treacheries, and wicked Principles of that POPERY which hath disturb'd this Nation above an hundred and fifty Years; fill'd it with Fears and Jealousies, and deserves the Hatred of all good Christians.

THE OTHER

Laying open that POPERY which the Papists own and profess; with the Chief Articles of their Faith, and some of the Principal Grounds and Reasons, which hold them in That Religion.

Narraverunt mihi Iniqui Fabulationes; sed non ut Lex tua, Psal. 119. v. 85.

By *J. L.* one of the Church of Rome.

To which is added,

A Book entituled,

The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, truly Represented.

In Answer to the aforesaid BOOK.

By a Protestant of the Church of England.

And for the Readers better convenience, in the Re-printing, it is so ordered, that every Chapter of the latter immediately follows that of the former, to which it is an Answer.

Licensed according to Order.

Dublin, Re-printed by *A. C.* & *S. H.* for the Society of Stationers, 1686.

5

07-3822

A

PAPIST

Mis-represented and Represented:

OR,

A twofold Character of Popery.

To which is added,

The Doctrine and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, truly Represented, &c

THE

INTRODUCTION.

THE *Father of Lies* is the *Author* of *Mis-representing*. He first made the Experiment of this *Black Art* in Paradise; having no surer way of bringing God's *Precept* into Contempt, and making our *First Parents* transgress, than by *mis-representing* the *Command*, which their *Maker* had laid upon them. And so unhappily successful he was in this his first attempt, that this has been his chief stratagem ever since, in all business of difficulty and concern: esteeming That his best *Means* for preserving and propagating Wickedness amongst Men, by which he first won them to lose their Innocence. And therefore there has nothing of *Good* yet come into the World, nothing been sent from Heaven, but what

 has

has met with this Oppoſition; the Common Enemy having imploy'd all his Endeavours of bringing it into diſcredit, and rendring it infamous, by *miſ-repreſenting*. Of this there are frequent inſtances in the *Old Law*, and more in the *New*. The truth of it was experienc'd on the *Perſon* of *Chriſt* himſelf, who, tho' he was the *Son of God*, the *immaculate Lamb*, yet was he not out of the reach of *Calumny*, and exempt from being *miſ-repreſented*. See how he was painted by malicious Men, the Sons of *Belial*, Miniſters of *Satan*; *a prophane and wicked Man, a breaker of the Sabbath, a Glutton, a Friend and Companion of Publicans and Sinners, a Fool, a Conjurer, a Traytor, a Seducer, a tumultuous Perſon, a Samaritan, full of the Devil; he hath Belzebub, and by the Prince of the Devils, caſteth he out Devils, (Mark 3. 22.)* There being no other way of frighting the People from embracing the *Truth*, following the Son of God, but by thus disfiguring him to the Multitude, reporting Light to be Darkneſs, and God to be the Devil. The Diſciples of Chriſt every where met with the like encounters. *Stephen* had the people ſtirred up againſt him, becauſe they *heard he had ſpoke blaſphemous words againſt* Moſes, *and againſt God, (Acts 6. 11.) Paul* alſo and *Silas*, for *exceedingly troubling the City, (Acts 16. 20.) Jaſon* alſo with them, becauſe he had *turned the World upſide down, and did contrary to the Decrees of* Cæſar, *(Acts. 17. 6, 7.) Paul* again, becauſe he did *teach all men every where againſt the people, and polluted the holy place, (Acts 21. 28.)* And becauſe he was *a peſtilent fellow, and a mover of Sedition among all the Jews throughout the World:* to which the *Jews alſo aſſented, ſaying that theſe things were ſo, (Acts 24. 5, 9.)* Neither did theſe *Calumnies*, theſe wicked *Miſ-repreſentations* ſtop here; he that ſaid, *The Diſciple is not above his Maſter, if they have called the Maſter of the Houſe Belzebub; how much more ſhall they call them of his Houſhold?* did not only foretell what was to happen to his *Followers* then preſent, but alſo to the *Faithful* that were to ſucceed them, and to his *Church* in future ages, they being all to expect the like Fate; that tho' they ſhould be never ſo juſt to God and their Neighbour, upright in their ways, and live in the Fear of God, and the Obſervance of his Laws; yet muſt they certainly be *reviled* and *hated* by the World, made a *by-word* to the people, and have the repute of *Ideots*, *Seducers*, and be a *ſcandal* to all Nations. And has not this been verified in all ages; See what was the State of *Chriſtians* in the primitive times, when as yet Vice had not corrupted the purity of the Goſpel. 'Tis almoſt impoſſible to believe in what contempt they were, and how utterly abominated. *Tertullian*, who was a ſharer of a great part, gives us ſo lamentable a account of the *Chriſtians* in his time, that 'tis able to move compaſſion in ſtones. He tells us, ſo many *malicious Slanders* were diſpers'd abroad, concerning the manner of their

Worſhip;

Worſhip; and their whole *Doctrine* deſcrib'd, not only to be *folly, and meer toys*, but alſo to be grounded on moſt *helliſh Principles*, and ſo to be full of *Impieties*, that the Heathens believ'd a man could not make profeſſion of *Chriſtianity*, without being tainted with all ſorts of *Crimes*; without being an enemy to the *Gods, to Princes, to the Laws, to good Manners, and to Nature.* Hence they conceiv'd ſuch *prejudice* againſt them, and they were render'd ſo *impious* in the opinion of the *Vulgar*; that whatſoever *Accuſations* were brought in, tho' never ſo *falſe and malicious*; whatſoever *Villanies* were laid to their charge; all was welcom to the *enraged multitude*, to which nothing ſeem'd *incredible* concerning *thoſe*, that were thus already *odious.* Upon this it was, that they were brought in guilty of *Atheiſm, of Superſtition, of Idolatry, of Cruelty, of Sedition, of Conſpiracies, of Treaſons*: and *bloody* Perſecutions were rais'd againſt them, to which the people were exaſperated by *Fears and Jealouſies: Quod Pontifices,* (as *Spondanus* ſays) *Gentilitiæ ſuperſtitionis Chriſtianos more ſolito, calumniis circumveniſſent, quaſi aliquid contra Imperium molirentur*; *Becauſe the Prieſts did uſe to divulge it abroad, that the Chriſtians were plotting againſt the Government.* Sp. Anno 286. Par. 5. Nor were theſe Crimes the whole Sum of their Charge; For beſides, every *publick calamity* and *misfortune* that befell the Commonwealth, was thrown upon them. If (*a*) *Daphnes* Temple was conſum'd by Lightning from Heaven, yet muſt the *Chriſtians* be condemn'd as the *Incendiaries*: If (*b*) the *City* was laid in Aſhes, it muſt be reveng'd on the *Chriſtians*; Nay (*c*) *Tertullian* has it, *if* Tiber *overflowed, if* Nile *watered not the Plains, if Heaven ſtop'd its Courſe, and did not pour its Rains here below*; *if there were Earth-quakes, Famine, or Plague*; *they would immediately cry out*, Chriſtianos ad Leones, *Caſt the Chriſtians to the Lions*, as the cauſe of all the Calamities that arrived in the World, and all the Evils that People ſuffer'd. And now the *Chriſtians* being thus reputed *profane* in their *Worſhip*, *Enemies* to the *Government*, and the *undoubted occaſions* of every *misfortune* throughout the Empire; 'tis eaſie to conceive, in what *contempt* they were, and how *deteſtable* amongſt the *Heathens*; But becauſe none can relate it ſo to the life, as (*d*) *Tertullian* has done, I'le ſet it down in his own words, as tranſlated by (*e*) Dr. *Howel*, in his *Hiſtory of the World. Is it not ſtrange* (ſays he) *that the hatred wherewith this Name is purſued in ſuch manner, blinds the minds of moſt Men, that when they witneſs the Probity of a* Chriſtian, *they mix in their Diſcourſe as a reproach*, that he hath embraced this Religion. *One*

(*a*) *Spond.* An. 362.

(*b*) *Id.* Anno 66.

(*c*) *Apo. c.* 40.

(*d*) *Apo. c.* 3.

(*e*) *P.* 1. *pag.* 936.

saith; *Truly, he of whom you speak is an Honest Man, if he were not a* Christian, *and his Life would be free from blame. Another*; *Do you know such a one, who had the reputation of a Wise and Discreet Man? He is lately turn'd* Christian. *(Again) These people, by an extreme* blindness of hatred, *speak to the advantage of the Name* Christian, *when they strive to render it* odious. *For, say they, How pleasant, and of what a good humour, was that Woman? How sociable and jovial was that Man? 'Tis pity they should be* Christians. *So they impute the amendment of their Lives to the Profession of* Christianity. *Some of them also purchase the* aversion *they carry against the Name* Christian, *which we bear, with the price of what is most precious to them; rather desiring to lose the sweetness of life, tranquility of mind, and all sorts of Commodities, than to see in their Houses That which they hate. A man, who heretofore had his mind full of* Jealousie, *can no longer endure the company of his* Wife, *what assurance soever he has of her Chastity, after once he perceives her to be turn'd* Christian; *and parts from her now, when her actions full of Modesty have extinguish'd all suspicions, wherewith he was heretofore mov'd. A* Father, *who of a long time endur'd the Disobedience of his* Heathenish Son, *resolves to take from him the hope of succeeding him in his Inheritance, for* turning Christian, *when at the same time, executing his Commands without murmuring. A* Master *that used his* Slave *gently, when his Carriage gave him some cause of distrust, now puts him far from him, for being a* Christian, *when he hath most assurance of his Fidelity. 'Tis committing a* Crime *to correct the disorders of a Mans Life, by the motions of a Holy Conversion to the* Christian Faith; *and the good which is produc'd by so happy a* Change, *works not so powerfully in the minds of men, as the hatred they have conceiv'd against us. Indeed this hatred is strange; and when I consider, that the Name of* Christian *only, makes it be so, I would willingly know, how a name can be criminal, and how a simple word can be accused?* Thus was Christianity wholly *infamous* amongst the *Heathens*, contemn'd and detested by all; and where *Lies* were in credit, *Calumnies* and *Slanders* confirm'd and back'd by *Authority*, there was no other Crime but *Truth*. And 'twas these *Calumnies*, these *false Actusations* (invented to cry down the Christian Religion,) oblig'd *Tertullian* to write his *Apology*, wherein he declar'd to the World, that *Christianity* was nothing like that, which the Heathens imagin'd it to be: That *Idolatry*, *Superstition*, *Impiety*, *Cruelty*, *Treachery*, *Conspiracies*, *&c.* was none of their *Doctrine*, but condemn'd and detested by them; that these *Crimes* were only the *malicious inventions* of the *Heathenish Priests*, who finding themselves unable to withstand the *force of Christianity*, had no other way to preserve *themselves* in *Repute*, and the *People* in their *Errour*, than by forming an ugly, odious, and most horrid *Vizor*, a damnable Scheme of Religion, than holding this forth to the World, and crying out, *This is the*

Religion

Religion of the Christians, these are their Principles; Behold their Ignorance, their Stupidity, their Profaneness; Behold their Insolence, their Villanies, a People unsufferable in a Commonwealth, Enemies to their Country and their Prince: And thus representing it as *monstrous* as they pleas'd, they brought an *odium* upon as many as own'd that *Name*, and condemn'd them for *Follies* and *Crimes*, that were no where, but in their own *Imagination*. And 'twas not only in *Tertullians* time, that *Christianity* lay under *this scandal*, but also in after ages: And therefore, as for the Vindication of the Christian Profession, he was forc'd to apologize for his time; so did after him St. *Cyprian*, *Arnobius*, and many other Ecclesiastical Writers; nay, and under Christian Emperors, the *Calumnies* of the *Heathens* yet being urg'd with much vigour and confidence, *Orosius* was oblig'd to write his History, and St. *Augustine his City of God*, in defence of the *Faith* and *Doctrine* of Christ. And now, when by the propagation of Christianity, and the laborious endeavours of her Professors, Heatheniſm was pretty well extinct; yet was not the Mouth of *Malice* stopp'd; the same *Calumnies*, which had been invented by the *Infidels*, being taken up by *evil Christians*. No one *going* out from the Communion of the *Church* of Christ, but what did, by reviving *old Scandals*, (and the addition of *fresh* ones,) endeavour to make her *infamous*, and *blacken* her with such Crimes, as could be thought most convenient for rendring her *odious* to all. It being look'd upon by as many as ever *went out* of her, the best means to justifie their *Separation*, and to gain to themselves the credit of *Orthodox* Christians; to paint *her* out in all the *Antichristian* Colours, and represent her as *Hellish*, as Wickedness could make her. 'Tis strange how much she suffer'd in this Point from the *Manichees*, and from the *Donatists*, and how much pains it cost Saint *Augustine*, to prove their *Accusations* to be meer *Calumnies*, principally intended to raise *prejudices* in the minds of the *People* against her; that so being convinc'd by these Hellish Artifices, of her teaching *unsound* and *profane Doctrine*, *wicked Principles*, and *humane Inventions* instead of *Faith*, might never think of going to *her*, to learn the *Truth*; nor even so much as suspect *her* to be the *Church* of Christ. This, Saint *Augustine* complains, was the chief cause of his continuing in the Error of the *Manichees* so long; and that he impugn'd with so much violence this *Church*. And therefore, after he was come to the knowledge of the *Truth*, he discover'd this to the World for the undeceiving others, who were caught in the same snare, making it part of his Confessions, *Confess. l. 6. c. 3. p. 1.*) *When I came to discover*, says he, *that*—— *I mingled Joy and Blushes, and was asham'd, that I had now for so many years been barking and railing, not against the Catholick Faith, but only against the fictions of my carnal conceits. For so temerarious and impious was I, that, those things*

things which I ought first to have learned from them by enquiry, I first charg'd upon them by Accusation; readier to impose Falshoods than to be inform'd of the Truth. —— And thus I so blindly accused the Catholick Church; now sufficiently clear'd to me that she taught not the Opinion, I so vehemently persecuted. And this he did, deluded and deceiv'd by the *Manichees*. And now since 'tis certain, that this has not been the case of Saint *Augustine* alone, but of as many almost, as have given ear to the *Deserters* of *this Church*; nay, is at this day the case of infinite numbers, who following that Great *Father*, when as yet in his *Errors*; *do not enquire, how this thing is believ'd or understood by her, but insultingly oppose all; as if so understood, as they imagine; not making any difference betwixt what the Catholick Church teaches, and what they think she teaches:* and so believing her to be guilty of as many *absurdities, follies, impieties*, &c. as the *Heathens* did of old: 'Tis evident, there's as much need now of *Apologies*, as ever there was in *Tertellian*'s or S. *Austin*'s time: Not *Apologies* to vindicate what is really her *Faith* and *Doctrine*; but rather to clear her from such *Superstitions*, *Profaneness*, and *wicked Principles*, as are *maliciously* or *ignorantly* charg'd upon her. And tho' the number of Calumnies, the in-sincerity of Adversaries, the obstinacy of a byas's'd Education render a performance in this kind, a just Task for a *Tertullian*'s, or St. *Augustine*'s hand; yet because I find no such eminent Pen engag'd in this design at present; and the shewing the *true Religion* in its *own Colours*, seems a Duty incumbent on every one that's a lover of Truth; I'le endeavour to pull off the *Vizor* from *suffering Christianity*, and apologize for the *Catholick Faith*; that Faith, I mean, maintained by those *Primitive Fathers*, with so much Vigour and Zeal; which being first planted in the *Head City* of the World by St. *Peter*, hath been propagated throughout the Universe, and derived down to us by many Christian Nations, in communion with that *See*, under the Protection of the *Holy Ghost*, and the Charge of *A Chief Pastor*, which beginning in that *great Apostle*, has continued in a *visible Succession* to these our days. This *Faith* it is, for which at present I design to make an Apology, which having been in all ages violently oppos'd, does at this time most *wrongfully* suffer, under *Calumnies* and *false Imputations*. I'le endeavour therefore to separate these *Calumnies* and *Scandals*, from what is *really* the *Faith* and *Doctrine* of that Church; I'le take off the *Black* and *Dirt*, which has been thrown upon her; and setting her forth in her *genuine* Complection, let the World see how much *fairer* she is, than she's *painted*; and how much she's *unlike* that *Monster*, which is shewn for her. And because the *Members* of this *Church* are commonly known by the name of *Papists*; I think I cannot take a more sincere, open, and compendious way, in order to the compleating this design, than by drawing forth a *double Character*

racter of a *Papiſt*: The *one* expreſſing a *Papiſt* in thoſe very *colours* as he is painted in the *imaginations* of the *Vulgar*, *Foul*, *black* and *Antichriſtian*; with the chief *Articles* of his *imagined Belief*, and *reputed Principles* of his Profeſſion. The *other* repreſenting a *Papiſt*, whoſe *Faith* and exerciſe of his *Religion*, is according to the *Direction* and *Command* of *his Church*. That ſo, theſe two being thus ſet together, their *difference* and *diſproportion* may be clearly diſcerned, and a diſcovery made, how *unlike Calumny* is from *Truth*; and how different a *Papiſt really is*, from what he's *ſaid to be*. The *former* Character is of a *Papiſt Miſ-repreſented*; the *other* of a *Papiſt Repreſented*. The former is a *Papiſt* ſo deform'd and monſtrous, that it juſtly deſerves the hatred of as many as own *Chriſtianity*; 'Tis a *Papiſt* that has diſturb'd this Nation now above an hundred years with Fears and Jealouſies; threatning it continually with Fire and Maſſacres, and whoſe whole Deſign has been, to rob the *Sovereign* of his Crown, and the *Subject* of his *Liberty* and *Property*. 'Tis a *Papiſt*, that is ſo abominable, ſo malicious, ſo unſufferable in any Civil Government, that, for my part, I deteſt him from my heart; I conceiv'd an hatred againſt him, and all his, from my Education, when as yet a *Proteſtant*; and now, being a *Roman Catholick*, I am not in the leaſt reconcil'd to *him*, nor his *Principles*, but hate him yet worſe. I am ſo far from thinking the *Laws* too ſevere againſt *ſuch Popiſh Recuſants*, that I could wiſh a far greater ſeverity were executed againſt them, their Favourers, and all ſuch as make men ſo ſottiſhly Religious. And if to be a *Proteſtant*, nothing more be requiſite, than to proteſt againſt *ſuch Popery*, to hate and deteſt it; I think my ſelf, and all *Roman Catholicks*, as good *Proteſtants*, as any whatſoever throughout his *Majeſties* Dominions. And I dare engage, that not only as many *Roman Catholicks*, as under the name of *Papiſts* have ſeverely ſmarted in this Nation, for being the Profeſſors of *ſuch kind of Popery*, but alſo that all *Roman Catholik Nations* in the World ſhall ſubſcribe to the Condemnation of all *ſuch* Popiſh Principles and Doctrines, ſhall joyn with all good *Proteſtants* for the extinguiſhing it, with all that profeſs or practice it, and utter rooting it out from his *Majeſties* three Kingdoms, and the whole Univerſe. The other *Papiſt* is one, that lives and believes according to what is preſcrib'd in the *Council of Trent*, in *Cateckiſms* ſet forth by Catholicks, and other Spiritual Books, for the Direction and Inſtruction of all in their Communion, whoſe *Faith* and *Doctrine* I have here ſet down, with ſome Grounds and Reaſons of it, and will ſo leave it to apologize for it ſelf. In drawing out the Character of the *former*, I have quoted no *Authors*, but have deſcrib'd him exactly according to the Apprehenſion I had of a *Papiſt*, fram'd by Me when I was a *Proteſtant*; with the addition only of ſome few points, which have been violently

charg'd againſt Me by ſome intimate Friends of late, to ſhew the unreaſonableneſs of my choice, after the quitting of that Communion. The latter is wholly copied out from the *Papiſt* that *I am now*; being the Sum of what I was taught, when reconcil'd to the Church of *Rome*, and which after ſixteen years converſation with Men of that Communion, in hearing their Sermons, in being preſent at their Catechiſing, in reading their Books, and diſcourſing with them, I have found to be their *Doctrine*. I have done both, I hope, with Sincerity and Truth, and without Paſſion. For as my endeavours have been, that my *Religion* ſhould loſe nothing by *Lies*, ſo neither do I deſire it ſhould gain by them; And did I but know of any thing in the following Papers, that has any relation to that *unchriſtian Artifice*, I would ſtrike it out immediately. And do here oblige my ſelf, upon information, either from Friend or Adverſary, to acknowledge the miſtake, as it ſhall be made appear, and make a publick Recantation. But it is time, we ſhould ſee what theſe *Papiſts* are.

An Anſwer to the Introduction.

THE *Introduction* conſiſts of two parts,

I. A general Complaint of the *Papiſts* being *Miſ-repreſented* among us.

II. An Acccount of the Method he hath taken to clear them from theſe *Miſ-repreſentions*.

I. As to the *Firſt*; Whether it be juſt, or not, muſt be examin'd in the ſeveral particulars. But here we muſt conſider, whether it ſerves the End it is deſigned for in this place, which is, to gain the Reader's good Opinion of their Innocency: Not meerly becauſe they complain ſo much of being injured, but becauſe the beſt Men in all Times have been *miſ-repreſented*; as he proves at large in this *Introduction*, from ſeveral Examples of the Old and New *Teſtament*, *but eſpecially of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and the Primitive Chriſtians*. But it is obſervable, that when Bp. *Jewel* began his excellent *Apology* for the *Church* of *England*, with a Complaint much of the ſame Nature, and produced the very ſame Examples, his Adverſary would by no means allow it to have any Force, being, as he called it, *Exordium Commune*, which might be uſed on both ſides, and therefore

fore could be proper to neither. And although it be reaſonable only for thoſe to complain of being *miſ-repreſented*, who having Truth on their ſide, do notwithſtanding ſuffer under the Imputation of Error; yet it is poſſible for thoſe who are very much *miſtaken*, to complain of being *miſ-repreſented*; and while they go about to remove the Miſrepreſentations of others, to make new Ones of their own. And as the beſt Men, and the beſt Things, have been miſ-repreſented; ſo other Men have been as apt to complain of it: and the worſt Things are as much miſ-repreſented, when they are made to appear not ſo bad as they are. For *Evil* is as truly miſ repreſented under the appearance of *Good*, as *Good* under the appearance of *Evil*; and it is hard to determine whether hath done the greater Miſchief.

So that if *the Father of Lies be the Author of Miſ-repreſenting*, (as the *Introduction* begins) we muſt have a care of him both ways. For when *he tried this black Art in Paradiſe*, (as our Author ſpeaks) it was both by miſ-repreſenting the Command, and the Danger of trangreſſing it. He did not only make the Command appear otherwiſe than it was; but he did very much leſſen the Puniſhment of Diſobedience, and by that means deluded our firſt Parents into that Sin and Miſery, under which their Poſterity ſtill ſuffers. Which ought to be a Caution to them, how dangerous it is to break the Law of God under the faireſt Colour and Pretences; and that they ſhould not be eaſily impoſed upon by falſe Gloſſes, and plauſible Repreſentations, though made by ſuch as therein pretend to be *Angels of Light*.

But although *the Father of Lies be the Author of Miſ-repreſenting*: yet we have no reaſon to think, but that if he were to plead his own Cauſe to Mankind, he would very much complain of being *miſ-repreſented* by them; and even in this reſpect, when they make him the *Father* of thoſe *Lies* which are their own Inventions. And can that be a certain Argument of Truth, which may as well be uſed by *the Father of Lies?*

And the great Inſtruments he hath made uſe of in deceiving and corrupting Mankind, have been as forward as any to complain of being *miſ-repreſented*. The true Reaſon is, Becauſe no great Evil can prevail in the World, unleſs it be repreſented otherwiſe than it is; and all Men are not competent Judges of

the Colours of Good and Evil; therefore when the Deſigns of thoſe who go about to deceive, begin to be laid open, they then betake themſelves to the faireſt Repreſentations they can make of themſelves, and hope that many will not ſee through their pretences.

If I had a mind to follow our Author's Method, I could make as long a Deduction of Inſtances of this kind. But I ſhall content my ſelf with ſome few Examples of thoſe who are allowed on both ſides to have been guilty of great Errors and Corruptions.

The *Arrians* pleaded they were *miſ-repreſented*, when they were taken for Enemies to Chriſt's Divinity; for all that they contended for, was only ſuch a moment of time, as would make good the Relation between Father and Son.

The *Pelagians*, with great ſucceſs for ſome time (and even at *Rome*) complained, that they were very much *miſ-repreſented*, as Enemies to God's Grace; whereas they owned and aſſerted the manifold Grace of God; and were only Enemies to Mens Idleneſs, and neglect of their Duties.

The *Neſtorians* gave out, that they never intended to make two Perſons in Chriſt, as their Adverſaries charged them; but all their deſign was to avoid Blaſphemy, in calling the Bleſſed Virgin *the Mother of God*; and whatever went beyond this, was their Adverſaries *Miſ-repreſentations*, and not their own Opinions.

The *Eutychians* thought themſelves very hardly dealt with, for ſaying, there was *but one Nature in Chriſt*; they did not mean thereby (as they ſaid) to deſtroy the Properties of the Humane Nature, but only to aſſert that its Subſiſtence was ſwallowed up by the Divine; and of all Perſons, thoſe have no reaſon to blame them, who ſuppoſe the Properties of one Subſtance may be united to another.

Even the *Gentile Idolaters*, when they were charged by the Chriſtians, *that they worſhipped Stocks and Stones*, complained, they were *miſ-repreſented*; for they were not ſuch Ideots, to take things for Gods, which had neither Life, nor Senſe, nor Motion in them. And when they were charged *with worſhipping other Gods as they did the Supream*; they deſired their Senſe might not be taken from common prejudices, or vulgar practices, but from the Doctrine of their Philoſophers; and they owned

owned a Sovereign Worſhip due to him that was Chief; and a ſubordinate and relative to ſome Celeſtial Beings, whom they made application to as Mediators between him and them. Muſt all theſe Complaints now be taken for granted? What then becomes of the Reputation of General Councils, or the Primitive Chriſtians? But as, if it were enough to be Accuſed, none would be Innocent; ſo none would be Guilty, if it were enough to complain of being *miſ-repreſented.*

Therefore in all Complaints of this Nature, it is neceſſary to come to particulars; and to examine with care and Diligence the Matters complained of, and then to give Judgment in the *Caſe.* I am glad to find our Author profeſſing ſo much *Sincerity and Truth without Paſſion*; and I do aſſure him I ſhall follow what he profeſſes: For the Cauſe of our Church is ſuch, as needs neither Tricks nor Paſſion to defend it; and therefore I ſhall endeavour to ſtate the Matters in Difference, with all the clearneſs and calmneſs that may be; and I ſhall keep cloſe to his Method and Repreſentations, without Digreſſions, or provoking Reflections.

II. But I muſt declare my ſelf very much unſatisfied with the Method he hath taken to clear his Party from theſe *Miſ-repreſentations.* For,

1. He takes upon him to draw a double Character of a Papiſt; and in the one he pretends to follow a certain Rule, but not in the other; which is not fair and ingenuous.

As to the one, he ſaith, *He follows the Council of* Trent, *and their allowed Spiritual Books and Catechiſms:* and we find no fault with this. But why muſt the other Part then be drawn by Fancy, or common Prejudices, or ignorant Miſtakes? Have we no Rule, whereby the Judgment of our Church is to be taken? Are not our Articles as eaſie to be had and underſtood, as the Decrees and Canons of the Council of *Trent?* I will not ask, How the Conncil of *Trent* comes to be the Rule and Meaſure of Doctrine to any here, where it was never received? But I hope I may, why our Repreſentations are not to be taken from the Senſe of our Church, as theirs from the Council of *Trent?* If he ſaith, *his Deſign was to remove common Prejudices, and vulgar Miſtakes*; it is eaſie to anſwer, if they are contrary to the Doctrine of our Church, we utterly diſown them.

them. We know very well there are Perſons, who have ſo falſe a Notion of *Popery*, that they charge the Rites and Cuſtoms of our Church with it: but we pity their Weakneſs and Folly, and are far from defending ſuch Miſ-repreſentations. But that which we adhere to, is the Doctrine and Senſe of our Church, as it is by Law eſtabliſhed; and what Repreſentations are made agreeable thereto, I undertake to defend, and no other. But if a perſon take the liberty to lay on what Colours he pleaſes on one ſide, it will be no hard matter to take them off in the other, and then to ſay, *How much fairer is our Church than ſhe is painted!* It is an eaſie, but not ſo allowable a way of diſputing, for the ſame perſon to make the Objections and Anſwers too; for he may ſo model and frame the Arguments by a little Art, that the Anſwers may appear very full and ſufficient; whereas if they had been truly repreſented, they would be found very lame and defective.

2. He pretends to give an Account why he quotes no Authors for his Miſ-repreſentations, which is very unſatisfactory, *viz. That he hath deſcribed the Papiſt therein, exactly according to the Apprehenſion he had of him when he was a Proteſtant.* But how can we tell what ſort of Proteſtant he was; nor how well he was inſtructed in his Religion? And muſt the Character now ſuppoſed to be common to Proteſtants, be taken from his ignorant, or childiſh, or wilful Miſtakes? Did ever any Proteſtant that underſtands himſelf, ſay, *That Papiſts are never permitted to hear Sermons which they are able to underſtand, or that they held it lawful to commit Idolatry*; Or, *that a Papiſt believes the Pope to be his great God, and to be far above all Angels, &c?* Yet theſe are ſome of his Miſrepreſentations. Did he in earneſt think ſo himſelf? If he did, he gives no good account of himſelf: if he did not, he gives a worſe; for then how ſhall we believe him in other things, when he ſaith, *He hath drawn his Miſ-repreſentations exactly according to his own Apprehenſions?* It is true, he ſaith, *he added ſome few points, which were violently charged on him by his Friends:* but we dare be bold to ſay, theſe were none of them. But let us ſuppoſe it true, that he had ſuch Apprehenſions himſelf. Are theſe fit to be printed as the Character of a Party? What would they ſay to us, if a Spaniſh

Convert

Convert ſhould give a Character of *Proteſtants*; according to the common Opinion the people there have of them; and ſet down in one Column their monſtrous Miſ-repreſentations, and in another, what he found them to be ſince his coming hither; and that in good Truth he ſaw they were juſt like other Men? But ſuppoſe he had falſe Apprehenſions before he went among them; why did he not take care to inform himſelf better before he changed? Had he no Friends, no Books, no Means to rectifie his Miſtakes? Muſt he needs leave one Church, and go to another, before he underſtood either? If this be a true Account of himſelf, it is but a bad Account of the Reaſons of his Change.

III. The Account he gives of the other part of his Character, affords as little Satisfaction: For although in the general, it be well that he pretends to keep to a Rule, (1.) He ſhews no Authority he hath to interpret that Rule in his own ſenſe. Now ſeveral of his Repreſentations depend upon his own private Senſe and Opinions, againſt the Doctrine of many others as zealous for the Church as himſelf; and what reaſon have we to adhere to his Repreſentations, rather than to theirs? As for inſtance, he ſaith, *The Pope's perſonal Infallibility is no Matter of Faith*: But there are others ſay it is, and is grounded on the ſame Promiſes which makes him Head of the Church. Why now muſt we take his Repreſentation rather than theirs? And ſo as to the *Depoſing Power*, he grants, *it hath been the Opinion of ſeveral Popes* (and Councils too) *but that it is no matter of Faith.* But whoſe Judgment are we to take in this Matter, according to the Principles of their Church? A private Man's, of no Name, no Authority, or of thoſe Popes and Councils who have declared it, and acted by it? And can any man of their Church juſtifie our relying upon his Word, againſt the Declaration of Popes and Councils? But ſuppoſe the Queſtion be about the Senſe of his own Rule, *the Council of Trent:* what Authority hath he to declare it, when the Pope hath expreſly forbidden all Prelates to do it, and reſerved it to the Apoſtolical See?

Bulla *Pii 4ti* ſuper Confirmat. Concil. Tridentini.

(2.) He leaves out, in the ſeveral Particulars, an eſſential part of the Character of a *Papiſt* ſince the Council of *Trent*;

Trent; which is, that he doth not only believe the Doctrines there defined to be true, but to be neceſſary to Salvation. And there is not a word of this in his Repreſentation of the Points of Doctrine, but the whole is managed as though there were nothing but a difference about ſome particular Opinions; whereas in truth, the Neceſſity of holding thoſe Doctrines, in order to Salvation, is the main Point in difference. If Men have no mind to believe their own Senſes, we know not how to help it; but we think it is very hard to be told, we cannot be ſaved unleſs we renounce them too. And this now appears to be the true State of the Caſe, ſince *Pius* the 4*th* drew up and publiſhed a Confeſſion of Faith, according to the Decrees and Canons of the Council of *Trent*, wherein Men are not only required *to believe their Traditions as firmly as the Bible, the Seven Sacraments, Tranſubſtantiation, the Sacrifice of the Maſs, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, worſhipping of Images, Indulgences, Supremacy*, &c. but they muſt believe, *that without believing theſe things, there is no Salvation to be had* in the ordinary way; for after the enumeration of thoſe Points, it follows, *Hanc veram Catholicam fidem extra quam nemo ſalvus eſſe poteſt, &c. This is the true Catholick Faith, without which no man can be ſaved*; *i. e.* The belief of theſe things is hereby declared as neceſſary to Salvation, as of any other Articles of the Creed. But it may be objected, *The ſubſcribing this Profeſſion of Faith, is not required of all Members of that Church.* To which I anſwer, That to make a Man a Member of it, he muſt declare that he holds the ſame Faith which the Church of *Rome* holds: And this is as much the Faith of the Roman Church, as the Pope and Council of *Trent* could make it. And it is now printed in the Roman *Ritual* at *Paris*, ſet forth by *Paul* the 5*th*, as the Confeſſion of Faith owned by the Church of *Rome*. And therefore this ought to have been a part of the true Repreſentation, as to the Doctrinal Points; but when he comes to the 35*th* Head, he then owns, *That unleſs Men do believe every Article of the Roman Faith, they cannot be ſaved, and he that disbelieves one, does in a manner disbelieve all.* Which may as well reach thoſe who diſown the Depoſing Power, and the Pope's perſonal Infallibility, as Us, ſince thoſe are accounted Articles of Faith by the ruling part of their Church, to whom it chiefly belongs to declare them; and the former hath been defined both by Popes and Councils.

(3.) He

(3.) He never ſets down what it is which makes any Doctrine to become a Doctrine of their Church. We are often blamed for charging particular Opinions upon their Church; but we deſire to know what it is which makes a Doctrine of their Church; *i. e.* whether frequent and publick Declaration, by the Heads and Guides of their Church, be ſufficient or not to that End? Our Author ſeems to imply the Neceſſity of ſome Conditions to be obſerved; for beſides *the Popes Authority*, he requires *due Circumſtances, and proceeding according to Law*: But who is to be Judge of theſe Circumſtances and legal Proceedings? And he never tells what theſe *Circumſtances* are. And yet after all, he ſaith, *The Orders of the Supream Paſtor are to be obey'd, whether he be infallible or not.* And this now brings the Matter home; *The Popes*, he confeſſes, *have owned the Depoſing Doctrine, and acted according to it:* And others are bound to obey their Orders, whether infallible or not; and conſequently they are bound by the Doctrine of their Church to act, when the Popes ſhall require it, according to the Depoſing Power. But he ſeems to ſay, in this Caſe, that a Doctrine of their Church is to be judged by their Number; for, ſaith he, *There are greater numbers that diſown this Doctrine.* I will not at preſent diſpute it; but I deſire to be informed, Whether the Doctrines of their Church go by majority of Votes, or not? I had thought the Authority of the Guides of the Church ought to have over-ballanced any Number of Diſſenters. For, what are thoſe who refuſe to ſubmit to the Dictates of Popes and Councils, but Diſſenters from the Church of *Rome?* The diſtinction of the *Court and Church of Rome*, is wholly impertinent in this Caſe. For, we here conſider not the meer Temporal Power which makes the Court, but the Spiritual Capacity of Teaching the Church: and if Popes and Councils may err in Teaching this Doctrine, why not in any other? I know there are ſome that ſay, *Univerſal Tradition is neceſſary to make a Doctrine of their Church.* But then no Submiſſion can be required to any Doctrine in that Church, till the Univerſal Tradition of it, in all Times, and in all Parts of the Chriſtian Church, be proved. And we need to deſire no better Terms than theſe, as to all Points of Pope *Pius* the 4*th* his Creed, which are in diſpute between us and them.

(4.) He makes uſe of the Authority of ſome particular Divines, as delivering the Senſe of their Church, when there are ſo many of greater Authority againſt them. Whereas, if we proceed by his own Rule, the greater Number is to carry it. Therefore we cannot be thought to *miſ-repreſent* them, if we charge them with ſuch things as are owned, either by the general and allowed Practices of their Church, or their publick Offices, or the generality of their Divines and Caſuiſts; or in caſe of a Conteſt, with that ſide which is owned by the Guides of their Church, when the other is cenſured; or which was approved by their Canonized Saints, or declared by their Popes and Councils, whoſe Decrees they are bound to follow. And by theſe meaſures I intend to proceed, having no deſign to *miſ-repreſent them*, as indeed we need not.

And ſo much in Anſwer to the *Introduction*.

I. Of

A Papist Mis-represented and Represented.

I. Of Praying to Images.

A Papist Mis-represented, *Worships Stocks and Stones for Gods. He takes no notice of the* Second Commandment, *but setting up* Pictures, *and* Images *of* Christ, *the* Virgin Mary, *and other his Saints; He prays to Them, and puts his Trust and Confidence in them; much like as the Heathens did in their Wooden Gods*, Jupiter, Mars, Venus, *&c. And for this reason, He erects stately Monuments to Them in his Churches, adorns them sumptuously, burns* Candles, *offers* Incense, *and frequently falls down prostrate before them, and with his Eyes fix'd on them, cries out*, Help me *Mary*, assist me *Anthony*, remember me *Ignatius*.

A *Papist Represented*, believes it damnable, to Worship Stocks and Stones for Gods, to Pray to *Pictures* or *Images* of *Christ*, the *Virgin Mary*, or any other Saints; as also, to put any Trust or Confidence in them. He keeps them by him indeed, to preserve in his Mind the Memory of the things Represented by them; as People are wont to preserve the Memory of their deceased Friends by keeping their Picture. He is taught to use them, by casting his eye upon the *Pictures* or *Images*, and thence to raise his heart to the *Prototypes*, and there to imploy it in Meditation, Love, Thanksgiving, Imitation, *&c.* as the Object requires: As many good Christians, placing a *Death-head* before them; from the sight of it, take occasion to reflect often upon their last End, in order to their better preparing for it; or by seeing *Old Time* painted with his *Fore-lock*, *Hour-Glass* and *Scythe*, turn their thoughts upon the swiftness of *Time*, and that whosoever neglects the *present*, is in danger of beginning then to lay hold, when there's no more to come. These *Pictures* or *Images* having this advantage, that they inform the mind by *one glance*, of what in reading requires a *Chapter*, and sometimes a *Volume*. There being no other difference between them, then that *Reading* represents *leisurely* and by degrees; and a *Picture*, *all at once*. Hence he finds a convenience in saying his Prayers with some devout *Pictures* before him; he being no sooner distracted, but the sight of these re calls his wandring thoughts to the right Object;

and as certainly brings ſomething good into his mind, as an *immodeſt Picture* diſturbs his heart with naughtineſs. And becauſe he is ſenſible that theſe holy *Pictures* and *Images* repreſent and bring to his mind *ſuch* Objects, which in his heart he loves, honours, and venerates; he cannot, but upon that account, love, honour, and reſpect the *Images* themſelves. As whoſoever loves their *Husband*, *Child*, or *Friend*, cannot but have ſome love and reſpect for their *Pictures*; and whoſoever loves and honours his *King*, will have ſome honour and eſteem for his *Image*: Not that he venerates any *Image* or *Picture*, for any *Virtue* or *Divinity* believ'd to be in them, or for any thing that is to be petition'd of them; but becauſe the honour that is exhibited to *them*, is referr'd to the *Prototypes* which they repreſent. So that 'tis not properly the *Images* he honours, but *Chriſt* and his *Saints by the Images*: As it is not properly the *Images* or *Pictures* of Kings or Dukes we generally reſpect or injure; but by their *Images* or *Pictures* we reſpect or injure Kings or Dukes themſelves. All the veneration therefore he expreſſes *before Images*, whether by kneeling, praying, lifting up the Eyes, burning Candles, Incenſe, *&c.* 'tis not at all done for the *Image*, but is *wholly* referr'd to the things repreſented, which he intends to honour by theſe actions. And how, by *ſo doing*, he breaks the *Second Commandment*, he cannot conceive; for he acknowledges only *one God*, and to him alone gives Sovereign Honour; and is ſo far from honouring *Images* as Gods, that for any ones ſatisfaction, he is ready to break or tear a *Crucifix*, or other *Image* whatſoever, into a thouſand pieces, and caſt them into the fire. And what reſpect he ſhews them, ſeems to him no more injurious to any of the *Commandments*, than 'tis for a Chriſtian to love and honour his *Neighbour*, becauſe he bears the *Image* of God in his *Soul*; to kiſs and eſteem the *Bible*, becauſe it *contains* and *repreſents* to him *God's Word*; or to love a good *Preacher* becauſe he *minds* him of his *Duty*; all which *reſpects* do not at all derogate from God Almighty's Honour; but are rather teſtimonies of our greater Love and Honour of him, ſince, for his ſake, we love and eſteem every thing that has any reſpect or relation to him.

I. *Of Praying to Images.*

IN this, and the other Particulars, where it is neceſſary, I ſhall obſerve this method;

1. To give a clear and impartial Account of the State of the Controverſy in as few words as I can.

2. To

2. To make some Reflections on what he saith, in order to the clearing them from Misrepresentations.

As to the State of this Controversy, as it stands, since the Council of *Trent*, we are to consider.

1. We must distinguish between what persons do in their own Opinion, and what they do according to the Sense of the Divine Law. It is possible that men may intend one thing, and the Law give another Sense of it: as is often seen in the Case of Treason; although the persons plead never so much they had no intention to commit Treason, yet if the Law makes their Act to be so, their disavowing it doth not excuse them. So it is in the present Case; Men may have real and serious Intentions, to refer their final, ultimate, and Sovereign Worship only to God; but if the Law of God strictly and severely prohibits this particular manner of Worship by Images, in as full, plain, and clear words as may be, and gives a Denomination to such Acts, taken from the immediate Object of it; no particular Intention of the Persons can alter that Denomination, or make the Guilt to be less than the Law makes it.

2. There can be no *Misrepresenting* as to the lawfulness of many External Acts of Worship, with Respect to Images, which are owned by them. But it doth not look fairly to put the Title, *Of Praying to Images*; for the Question is, *about the Worship of Images:* Whereas this Title would insinuate, as though we did directly charge them with *Praying to their Images, without any farther Respect.* Which we are so far from charging them with, that I do not know of any People in the World, who are not like *Stones* and *Stocks* themselves, who are liable to that Charge. The *PENDETS* in the *East-Indies* are fully cleared from it, by *Thavenet*, as well as *Bernier*. And it would be hard we should not allow the same to our Fellow-Christians. I do therefore grant what our Author saith, *viz. That all the Veneration they express before Images, whether by kneeling, praying, lifting up the Eyes, burning Candles, Incense,* &c. *is not at all done for the Image, but is wholly referr'd to the things represented, which he intends to honour by these Actions.* But I hope now, it is no Misrepresenting for us to say, that *they do kneel, pray, lift up their Eyes, burn Candles, Incense,* &c. *before*

Thevenot *Voyage des Indes p.* 188. Bernier *Memoirs. Tom.* 2. *p.* 172.

before their Images; which is all I charge them with at present.

3. To perform these Acts before Images, without a design to worship the Images by them, is declared, by great Divines of the Church of *Rome*, to be next to Heresie. The Case was this; There were before the Council of *Trent*, several Persons who lived in Communion of that Church, but by no means approved the Worship of Images, such as *Durandus*, *Holcot*, *Picus Mirandula*, and others. Now these Persons thought fit to comply in these External Acts, but declared they intended not to worship the Images, but the Objects before them. Since the Council of *Trent* decreed Images were to be worshiped, this Case hath been debated by the Divines and Casuists of greatest Reputation among them; And *Suarez* saith, *This way of Durandus is dangerous, rash, and savours of Heresie*; and he saith further from *Medina*, *That it was* Victoria's *Opinion, that it was Heretical*,; but he adds, that his own Opinion, *that Images were truly and properly to be Worshiped, was generally received by their Divines*: and therefore I need name no more.

Suarez in 3. part. Qu. 25. Disp. 53. §. 3. 2do. principaliter, & §. 5.

4. It is granted by their Divines and Casuists, that the People in the Worship of Images may easily fall into Idolatry.

(1.) If the Worship do not pass from the Image to the Thing represented. And so *Aquinas* himself determines, That no Irrational Creature is capable of Worship, but as it hath Respect to a Rational Being. But here lies the Difficulty, how an Extrinsecal Relation to an Object of Worship, where the Thing is confessed to deserve none, can give any Reason, for its being properly worshiped. But they all grant, if the Worship stop at the Inanimate part, it can be no other than the Worship of Stocks and Stones.

(2.) If the Worship be given to the Image, which is proper to God alone. This *Bellarmine* is forced to grant, because the Evidence is so clear in Antiquity, that the *Gnosticks* were condemned for some Worship which they performed to the Image of Christ. Now, we cannot think that these *Gnosticks* were such Sots, as to take the Image of Christ to be Christ himself; and therefore whatever Worship it was,

Bellarmine *de Imag.* l. 2. c. 21.

it

it must be Relative, *i. e.* given to the Image for the sake of Christ represented by it.

(3.) *If the People believe any Divinity to be in the Images, or put any Trust or Confidence in them,* then the Council of *Trent* it self owns such to be like the Heathen Idolaters. Now, how shall it be known when the People believe Divinity to be in Images, but by some more than ordinary Presence or Operation in or by them? by their having a greater Opinion of one Image than of another of the same Person? by their going long Pilgrimages to certain Images in hopes of Relief, when they might easily cause Images to represent at home?

Concil. Trident Sess. 25.

And that such are no extravagant Imaginations, is known to all who have heard of *Loretto*, or *Compostella*, or other places nearer home. I need not mention the Complaints of *Polydore Virgil*, *Cassander*, or *Wicelius* to this purpose, who all died in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*; for the same is very lately complained of by a considerable Person in that Communion, who saith, *The greatest part of the Devotion of the People of* Italy, Spain, *and* Portugal, *consists in prostrating themselves before Images, and going in Pilgrimage to them, and hoping for Remission of their Sins by so doing.* And another very lately yields, *That to avoid the peril of Idolatry, to which* (he saith) *the People is evidently exposed by the use of Images, it would be necessary to take them away from the Altars, and by no means to have them allowed for the Objects of Religious Worship.*

Moyens Surs & honestes pour la Conversion de tous les Heretiques. To. 2. p. 115.

Entretiens de Philalethe & Philerene. 2da part. p. 157.

The Question now is, Whether the Council of *Trent* hath taken any effectual Course to prevent these *Abuses*? If not, what *Misrepresenting* is it to charge the Abuses upon the Doctrines and Practices allowed by it?

The Remedies prescribed by the Council, are these;

1. *Declaring that there is no Divinity or Vertue in them for which they should be worshipped; and that nothing is to be desired of them, nor any Trust or Confidence to be put in them.*

2. *Expressing their earnest desire, that if any Abuses have crept in, they may be removed.*

But

But in the mean time the Council decrees, *the Images not only to be useful to be set up in Churches, but to have due Honour and Worship given them there, for the sake of those they represent; as not only putting off the Hat, but falling down before them.* And the *Roman Catechism* declares, *That this Worship is very beneficial to the People, and so much is to be told them; and that Images are to be in Churches, not meerly for Instruction, sed ut colantur*, that they may be worshipped.

Catechis. Rom. Part. 3. c. 2. §. 14.

But what could the Council do more, than to desire all Abuses may be taken away; and is it not then the fault of others, and not of the Council, if they be not?

I grant, the Council doth desire *Abuses may be taken away, if any such be*; but then it enumerates those Abuses, in *Heterodox Images, in making Gain of Images, in painting them too wantonly:* but besides, it doth say, *that all Superstition be removed in the Sacred Use of Images*; but it doth not say in *the Worship of them*; and so it may relate to *Magick* and *Divination*. But that the Council could not prevent, or design to prevent the *Abuses* mention'd in the Worship of Images, will appear by these things.

1. The Cuoncil of *Trent* allows the highest relative Worship to be given to them: it setting no bounds to it, so it be for the sake of the Prototypes.

2. It allows a Worship to be given to the Images themselves too; for it confirms the second Council of *Nice*, which decreed an inferiour Adoration to be given to them.

3. It disapproves no Customs then practised among them in the Worship of Images; which were all known, and by many complained of, both as Pilgrimages to them, and the carrying of them about in Procession, and the solemn Consecration of them; the Form whereof is not only inserted, but inlarged in the new Pontifical since the Council of *Trent*. And it is to be observed, that in the old Pontifical, *A. D.* 1511. there is no Form for consecrating an Image; in that of *Paul* the 3*d*, it is inserted, but out of *Durandus*; but in that of *Clement* the 8*th*, it is put in more largely, and as authentically as if it had been always there. And is not this the way to reform the Worship of Images?

To come now to our Author's Reflections on the *Misrepresentation* he saith hath been made as to this Point.

1. *A Papist represented, believes it damnable to worship Stocks and Stones for Gods; to pray to Pictures or Images of Christ, the Virgin* Mary, *or any other Saints.*

These Expressions are capable of a double Sense, and therefore this is not fair Representing.

(1.) *To worship Stocks or Stones for Gods*, may signifie two things. (1.) To believe the very Stocks and Stones to be Gods. And this we do not charge them with. (2.) To give to Images made of Wood and Stone, the Worship due only to God; and so by construction of the Fact, to make them *Gods*, by giving them *Divine Worship*. And if they will clear themselves of this, they must either prove that *External Adoration* is no part of Divine Worship, (notwithstanding the Scripture makes it so, and all the rest of Mankind look upon it as such, even Jews, Turks, and Infidels) or that their external Adoration hath no respect to the Images (which is contrary to the Council of *Trent*) or that Divine Worship being due to the Being Represented, it may be likewise given to the Image. And how then could the *Gnosticks* be condemned for giving Divine Worship to the Image of Christ, which *Bellarmine* confesses; and is affirmed by *Irenæus*, *Epiphanius*, S. *Augustine*, and *Damascen*?

(2.) *To pray to Images of Christ, or the Blessed Virgin*, may likewise be taken in two senses. (1.) To pray to them, so as to expect to be heard by the meer Images, and so we do not charge them with it. (2.) To pray to them, so as to expect to be rather heard by themselves for praying to them by their Images. And if this be not so; to what end are the Prayers made in the Consecration of Images, for those that shall pray before them? To what purpose do so many go in long Pilgrimages to certain Images, if they do not hope to be better heard for praying there?

But he goes on, 2. *He keeps them by him indeed, to keep in his mind the memory of the things represented by them.* And is this all in good Truth? We will never quarrel with them, if this be true Representing. No, that he dares not say.

But, 3. *He is taught to use them.* But how? *by casting his Eye upon the Pictures or Images, and thence to raise his Heart to the Prototypes.* And is this all yet? No.

But, 4. He finds a double conveniency in the uſe of them. (1.) *They repreſent at one glance*; and Men may eaſily make *good* Reflections, as *upon the ſight of a Death's Head, or* Old Time *painted with his Fore-lock, Hour-glaſs, and Scyth.* And will he undertake, that Images ſhall be uſed in Churches for no other End? Was the Picture of *Old Time* ever *conſecrated*, or placed upon the *Altar*, or elſewhere, *that it might be worſhipped?* as the *Roman Catechiſm* ſpeaks of their Images. (2.) *They cure Diſtractions; for they call back his wandring Thoughts to the Right Object.* What is this *Right Object?* the Image, or the Perſon repreſented? And that muſt be either a Creature, or God himſelf. If it be a Creature, doth not this imply that it is made a *Right Object of Worſhip?* If God himſelf, how doth an Image cure our Diſtraction, in the Worſhip of an infinite inviſible Being; when the very Image is moſt apt to diſtract our Thoughts, by drawing them down from his Divine and Adorable Perfections, to the groſs and mean Repreſentations of an Image. But are we yet to come to the utmoſt uſe of them? No.

But, 5. *He cannot but love, honour, and reſpect the Images themſelves, for the ſake of thoſe they repreſent.* Will this content them? And will he promiſe to go no further? It is hard to part upon Terms of meer *Reſpect and decent Regard*, where there is no encroachment upon *Divine Worſhip.* And here we are at a ſtand.

But he goes further. 6. And ſo he is come at laſt, *to Veneration before Images.* And is this all? Dares he deny *Veneration to Images*, when the Council of *Trent* hath determined it. *Eiſque venerationem impartiendam?* What is this Veneration *before Images* only? *Bellarmine* hath a Chapter on purpoſe to prove, that *true and proper Worſhip is to be given to Images.* And was he a *Miſrepreſenter? Suarez* ſaith, *It is an Article of Faith, that Worſhip is to be given to them.* But if the Veneration be only before them, why are they conſecrated, and ſet up in places proper for Adoration?

But, 7. *To ſatisfie any one that he is far from making Gods of his Images, he is ready to break them into a thouſand pieces.* What, a Conſecrated Image? Dares he take a Crucifix from the Altar and tear it in pieces? This doth not look like *the Love, Honour, and Reſpect* he mentioned before, not

to

to name *Veneration.* And I am afraid this is a ſtrain beyond true Repreſenting: Yet at length he hath found ſome pretty Parallels for the *Veneration of Images themſelves*; and ſo we are come at laſt to the main Point. But this is not directly owned; yet in the way of his Repreſenting, it is fairly inſinuated by his Parallels.

1. *A Chriſtian loves and honours his Neighbour, becauſe he bears the Image of God in his Soul.* But doth he therefore take him and ſet him before him when he kneels at his Devotion; to raiſe his Mind, and cure his Diſtractions? Would he ſet him upon the Altar, and burn Incenſe before him, becauſe of the Image of God in him? Is there no difference between the *Object of Chriſtian Love*, and of *Divine Worſhip?* Nor between a Spiritual Inviſible Divine Image in the Souls of Men, and a Material and Corporeal Repreſentation?

2. *We may kiſs and eſteem the Bible, becauſe it contains and repreſents to Us Gods Word.* But when we kiſs and eſteem the Bible, we remember the ſecond Commandment is in it; and we dare not break his Law, when we pretend to honour his Word. But we think there is ſome difference between *Reverence* and *Reſpect* to the *Bible*, and *falling down* before an Image. The Circumſtances of the one declare it to be meer *Reſpect*, and a *Religious Decency*; and if the other be not *External Adoration*, we know not what it is

3. *A good Preacher is loved, becauſe he minds Men of their Duty.* But what ſhould we ſay to him that ſhould therefore *kneel down and ſay his Prayers, and burn Candles and Incenſe before him*, out of a Reſpect to his good Doctrine? Did S. *Peter*, or S. *Paul* like this, when Men would have worſhipped them? A good Preacher would tell them of their Duty, as they did; and take Men off from the Worſhip of any Creature, animate or inanimate, and direct them to worſhip God alone, who made Heaven and Earth.

II. Of Worſhipping Saints.

HE *makes Gods of* Dead Men, *ſuch as are departed hence, and now are no more able to* hear, *or* ſee, *or* underſtand *his neceſſities: And tho' God be ſo good as to invite all to come unto him, and to apply themſelves to their only and infinite Mediator* Jeſus Chriſt: *Yet ſo ſtupid is He, that neglecting, and, as it were, paſſing by both God and his only Son, and all their Mercies, he betakes himſelf to his* Saints, *and there pouring forth his Prayers, he confides in them as his* Mediators *and* Redeemers, *and expects no Bleſſing, but what is to come to him by their Merits, and through their hands: And thus, without ſcruple or remorſe, robs God of his Honour.*

HE believes there's only *one* God; and that 'tis a moſt damnable *Idolatry* to make Gods of Men, either *living* or *dead*. His *Church* teaches him indeed, (and he believes) *That it is good and profitable to deſire the Interceſſion of the Saints, reigning with Chriſt in Heaven*; but that they are *Gods*, or his *Redeemers*, he is no where taught; but deteſts all ſuch Doctrine. He confeſſes, That we are all redeem'd by the Blood of *Chriſt* alone, and that he is our *only Mediator* of *Redemption*: But as for Mediators of *Interceſſion*, (that is, ſuch as we may deſire lawfully to *pray for us*) he does not doubt, but 'tis acceptable to God, we ſhould have many. *Moſes* was *ſuch a Mediator* for the *Iſraelites*; *Job* for his three Friends; *Stephen* for his Perſecutors. The *Romans* were thus deſir'd by Saint *Paul* to be his *Mediators*; ſo were the *Corinthians*, ſo the *Epheſians*; ſo almoſt every *ſick* man deſires the *Congregation* to be his *Mediators*; that is, to be remembred in their Prayers. And ſo he deſires the *Bleſſed* in Heaven to be his *Mediators*; that is, that they would *pray to God for him*. And in *this*, he does not at all neglect *coming to God*, or rob him of his Honour; but directing all his Prayers up to *him*, and making *him* the *ultimate Object* of all his Petitions, he only deſires ſometimes the *Juſt on Earth*, ſometimes *thoſe in Heaven*, to joyn their Prayers to his, that ſo the number of *Petitioners* being increas'd, the *Petition* may find better acceptance in the ſight of God. And this is not to make them *Gods*, but only *Petitioners to God*; 'tis not to make them his *Redeemers*, but only *Interceſſors to his Redeemer*; he having no hopes of obtaining any thing, but of God *alone*, by, and through the Merits of Chriſt; for which he deſires the *Saints* in Heaven, and *good men* on Earth,

Ep. ad { *Rom.* *Cor.* *Eph.*

to

to offer up their Prayers with his; the Prayers of the *Just* availing much before God. But now, how the Saints in Heaven *know* the Prayers and Neceſſities of ſuch, who addreſs themſelves to them, whether by the Miniſtry of Angels, or in the Viſion of God, or by ſome particular Revelation, 'tis no part of his *Faith*, nor is it much his concern it ſhould be determin'd. For his part he does not doubt, but that God, who acquainted the *Prophets* with the knowledge of things, that were yet to come many hundred years after; That inform'd *Elijah* of the King of *Syria*'s Counſel, tho' private, reſolv'd on in his Bed-chamber, and at a diſtance; (2 *Kings* 6. 12.) can never want means of letting the *Saints* know the deſires of thoſe who beg their *Interceſſion* here on Earth: Eſpecially ſince our Saviour tells, That *Abraham* heard the Petitions of *Dives*, who was yet at a *greater* diſtance, even in *Hell*; and told him likewiſe the manner of his living, while as yet on Earth. Nay, ſince 'tis generally allow'd, that even the very *Devils* hear thoſe deſperate wretches, who call on them: Why ſhould he doubt, that *Saints* want this Priviledge, in ſome manner granted to ſinful men, and to wicked Spirits; who, (tho departed this life) are not ſo properly *dead*, as tranſlated from a mortal life, to an immortal one; where, enjoying God Almighty, they loſe no Perfections which they enjoy'd, while on Earth, but poſſeſs all in a more *eminent* manner; having more *Charity*, more *Love*, and being more acceptable to God than ever; becoming like Angels: And as theſe offered up their Prayers for *Jeruſalem*, and the Cities of *Judah*, (*Zach.* 1. 12.) ſo undoubtedly they likewiſe *fall down before the Lamb, having every one of them Harps, and golden Vials full of Odours, which are the Prayers of the Saints*, Apoc. 5. 8.

II. *Of Worſhipping Saints.*

FOr the clear ſtating this Controverſy, theſe things are to be premiſed.

1. We do not charge them, *that they make Gods of dead men, i. e.* that they believe the Saints to be Independent Deities. For this our Author confeſſes *were a moſt damnable Idolatry.*

2. We do not ſay, that the State of the Church of *Rome*, with reſpect to the Worſhip of dead men, is as bad as Heatheniſm. For we acknowledge the true Saints and Martyrs to have been, not only good and Vertuous, but extraordinary Perſons, in great Favour with God, and highly deſerving

ſerving our Eſteem and Reverence, as well as Imitation; whereas the Heathen Deified Men, were vile and wicked Men, and deſerved not the common Eſteem of Mankind, according to the Accounts themſelves give of them. And we own the common Doctrine and Advantages of Chriſtianity to be preſerved in the Church of *Rome*.

3. We do not deny, that they do allow ſome external Acts of Worſhip to be ſo proper to God alone, that they ought to be given to none elſe beſides him. And this they call *Latria*; and we ſhall never diſpute with them about the proper ſignification of a Word, when the Senſe is agreed, unleſs they draw Inferences from it, which ought not to be allowed. To this *Latria*, they refer not only Sacrifice, but all that relates to it, as Temples, Altars, and Prieſts: ſo that by their own Confeſſion, to make theſe immediately and properly to the Honour of any Saint, is to make a God of that Saint, and to commit Idolatry.

4. They confeſs, that to pray to Saints to beſtow Spiritual or Temporal Gifts upon us, were to give to them the Worſhip proper to God, who is the only giver of all good things. For elſe I do not underſtand, why they ſhould take ſo much pains to let us know, that whatever the Forms of their Prayers and Hymns are, yet the Intention and Spirit of the Church, is only to deſire them to pray for us, and to obtain things for us by their Interceſſion with God.

But two things cannot be denied by them.

1. That they do uſe ſolemn Invocation of Saints in places of Divine Worſhip, at the ſame time they make their Addreſſes to God himſelf, with all the Circumſtances of External Adoration, with bended Knees and Eyes lifted up to Heaven; and that this Practice is according to the Council of *Trent*, which not only decrees an humble Invocation of them, but declares it to be impiety to condemn mental and vocal Supplication to the Saints in Heaven. Sect. 25.

2. That they do own making the Saints in Heaven to be their Mediators of Interceſſion, but not of Redemption; although Chriſt be our Mediator in both ſenſes.

And upon theſe two Points this Controverſy depends.

Let

Let us now ſee what our *Repreſenter* ſaith to them.

1. *His Church teaches him indeed, and he believes that it is good and profitable, to deſire the Interceſſion of the Saints reigning with Chriſt in Heaven; but that they are either Gods, or his Redeemers, he is no where taught, but deteſts all ſuch Doctrine.*

There are two Ways of *deſiring Interceſſion of others for us.*

1. By way of *Friendly Requeſt*, as an Act of mutual Charity; and ſo, no doubt, we may deſire others here on Earth to pray for us.

2. By way of *Humble Supplication*, with all the external Acts of Adoration: and we cannot think St. *Peter*, or St. *Paul*, who refuſed any thing like *Adoration* from men, would have been pleaſed to have ſeen men fall down upon their Knees before them; and in the ſame poſture of Devotion in which they were praying to Almighty God, to put their Names into the middle of their *Litanies*, and ſo pray them then to pray for them.

But how are we ſure that their Church teaches no more than this? I have read over and over the Council of *Trent*, and the *Roman Catechiſm* about it, and I can find no ſuch limitation of their ſenſe there, where, if any where, it ought to be found. The Council of *Trent* mentions both the *Prayers*, and *the Help and Aſſiſtance* of the Saints which they are to fly to. If this *Help* and *Aſſiſtance* be no more than their *Prayers*, why is it mentioned as diſtinct? Why is *their reigning together with Chriſt in Heaven* ſpoken of, but to let us underſtand they have a Power to *Help* and *Aſſiſt*? For what is their Reigning to their Praying for us? But I have a further Argument to prove the Council meant more, *viz.* the Council knew the common Practices and Forms of Invocation then uſed and allowed, and the general Opinion, that the Saints had power to Help and Aſſiſt thoſe who prayed to them. If the Council did not approve this, why did it inſert the very words upon which that Practice was grounded? They likewiſe very well knew the Complaints which had been

been made of these things; and some of their own Communion cried shame upon some of their Hymns. *Wicelius* saith, one of them, *Salve Regina*, &c. *is full of downright Impiety, and horrible Superstition, and that others are wholly inexcusable. Lud. Vives* had said, *He found little difference in the Peoples opinion of their Saints in many things, from what the Heathens had of their Gods.* These things were known, and it was in their power to have redressed them, by declaring what the Sense of the Council was, and that whatever Forms were used, no more was to be understood by them, but *praying to them to pray for them* Besides, the Council of *Trent*, in the very same Session, took care *about reforming the Missal and Breviary*; why was no care taken to reform these *Prayers and Hymns*, which they say are not to be construed by *the Sense of the Words*, but by *the Sense of the Church?* There was time enough taken for doing it; for the *Reformed Missal* was not published till six Years after the *Council*, nor the *Breviary* till four. In all that time, the *Prayers* and *Hymns* might easily have been altered to the *Sense of the Church*, if that were truly so. But instead of that, a very late French Writer cries out *of the necessity of Reforming the Breviaries as to these things*; wherein he confesses, *Many Hymns are still remaining, wherein those things are asked of Saints, which ought to be asked of God alone; as being delivered from the Chains of our Sins, being preserved from Spiritual Maladies, and Hell-Fire, being inflamed with Charity, and made fit for Heaven. In good Conscience*, saith he, *is not this joyning the Saints with God himself, to ask those things of them which God alone can give?* And whatever Men talk of *the Sense of the Church*, he confesses, *the very Forms, and natural Sense of the Words, do raise another Idea in Mens minds; which ought to be prevented.*

But doth not the Roman Catechism explain this to be the Sense of the Church? I have examined that too, with all the care I could, about this matter. And I cannot find any necessity from thence of putting this Sense upon them. I grant in one place, where it explains *the difference of the Invocation of God and Saints*, it saith, *We are to pray to God as the Giver, and to Saints that they would obtain things of God for us*; and then it adds, *the Forms differ, that to God is, Miserere Nobis, and Audi Nos*; that to Saints is, *Ora pro Nobis*. Very well! And

is

Wicel. *in Enchiridio Abusuum.*

Vives *in Aug. de Civit. Dei l.* 8. *c.* 27.

Entretiens de Philalethe & Philerene Part 2. p. 160, 163. 165.

Catech. Rom. Part 4. *c.* 6. *n.* 2, 3.

is there then no other Form owned or allowed in the Church of *Rome* to Saints beſides this? Hold a little, ſaith the *Catechiſm*, for *it is lawful to make uſe of another Form*; and that is, *we may pray to Saints too*, *Ut noſtri miſereantur*. And how doth this now differ from that to God, but only in Number? But it adds, *that the Saints are very pitiful*; then ſurely we are encouraged to pray to them for *Help and Pity*. *Yes*, ſaith the *Catechiſm*, *we may pray to them, that being moved with pity toward us, they would help us with their Favour and Interceſſion with God*. But yet this doth not clear the Matter; for elſewhere the *Roman Catechiſm* attributes more to *Saints* than meer *Interceſſion*; and we may pray to them for what is in their Power: For where it undertakes to give an exact Account of the Reaſon of *Invocation of Saints and Angels*; it there parallels them with *Magiſtrates under a King*; and ſaith, *they are Gods Miniſters in governing the Church*; *Invocandi itaque ſunt quod & perpetuo Deum intuentur, & Patrocinium Salutis noſtræ libentiſſime ſuſcipiunt*. What is this *Patrocinium ſalutis noſtræ?* Is it only *Praying and Interceſſion with God?* That cannot be, for it inſtances preſently in *Deliverances by Angels, and* Jacob's *praying to the Angel to bleſs him*, and not meerly to intercede for him. *But though this is ſpoken of Angels*, yet from hence it infers *the Invocation of Saints* too. But what need we inſiſt more on this, ſince they do own the *Miniſtry of Saints* as well as Angels, with reſpect to the Church; and do *Canonize Saints* for particular Countries, as lately *S. Roſa* for *Peru*. And where there is ſuch a particular Protection ſuppoſed, what incongruity is it to interpret the Form of their Prayers, according to a Doctrine ſo received and allowed? But of this more under the next Head.

Catech. Rom. Part. 3. *c.* 2. *n.* 4, 6.

Cum præſint negotiis Sanctis & rerum noſtrarum curam gerant. Bellarm. *de Sanct. Beatit. l.* 1. *c.* 20. §. *deinde. Non ſolum ab Angelis ſed etiam à ſpiritibus beatorum hominum Regi & Gubernari fideles viatores. Id. ib. c.* 18. §. *nos autem.*

2. *He confeſſes that we are all redeemed by the Blood of Chriſt alone, and that he is our only Mediator of Redemption; but as for Mediators of Interceſſion, he doth not doubt but it is acceptable with God we ſhould have many.*

I would ask, concerning this Diſtinction, the Queſtion which *Chriſt* asked concerning *John*'s *Baptiſm*, *Is it from Heaven, or of Man?* No doubt there may be ſuch a Diſtinction of *Mediators*, if God pleaſe to make them. But

who hath Authority to appoint *Mediators* with him beſides himſelf? Is it not uſurping his Prerogative, to appoint the great Officers of his Kingdom for him? Would any Prince upon Earth allow this, *viz.* when he hath abſolutely declared his Pleaſure, that his own Son ſhould preſent Petitions to him, that others ſhall take upon them to ſet up Maſters of Requeſts themſelves? Can any thing be plainer in the New Teſtament, than that God hath appointed the *Mediator* of *Redemption*, to be our *Mediator* of *Interceſſion?* And that his *Interceſſion* is founded upon his *Redemption*. As the *High Prieſt*'s going into the *Holy of Holies* to intercede for the People, was upon the *Blood of the Sacrifice of Expiation*, which he carried in with him. If there were no Revelation in this Matter, there might be ſome reaſon for it. But ſince the Revelation is ſo clear in it, this Diſtinction looks juſt like the *Socinians* Diſtinction of a *God by Nature*, and a *God by Office*; which was framed on purpoſe to avoid the plain Texts of Scripture which called Chriſt *God*. So doth this look as if it were intended to avoid that clear Text, which ſaith, *There is one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Chriſt Jeſus.* Which is preſently anſwered with this Diſtinction; although there be not the leaſt ground in that or any other Text for it.

John 14. 13, 14, 16, 23, 24. Heb. 7. 25. & 9. 7, 24. 1 Jo. 2. 1.

1 Tim. 2. 5.

Yes, ſaith our Author, Moſes *was ſuch a Mediator for the Iſraelites*; Job *for his three Friends*; Stephen *for his Perſecutors: The Romans were deſired by S.* Paul *to be his Mediator, and the* Corinthians *and* Epheſians; *ſo almoſt every ſick Perſon deſires the Congregation to be his Mediator, that is, to be remembred in their Prayers.*

But is there no difference between Men praying for one another, and deſiring others to pray for them here on Earth, and an *humble Invocation* of the *Saints in Heaven* to be our *Mediators* of *Interceſſion* with God there?

There is a threefold diſparity in the Caſe.

1. Here upon Earth we converſe with one another as Fellow Creatures, and there is no danger of our having an Opinion thereby, that were able to aſſiſt one another any other way than by our Prayers. But the caſe is very different as to the Saints in Heaven, who by being addreſſed to there

there by ſuch ſolemn Invocation, may too eaſily be conceived to have the Power of beſtowing ſuch Bleſſings upon thoſe who call upon them.

2. Heaven is looked upon by all Mankind who direct their Devotions thither, as the particular Throne of God, where he dwells, and diſcovers himſelf after another manner than he doth upon the Earth. And we are directed to pray to our *Father in Heaven*; where he is repreſented as infinitely above all his Creatures; and the great Concernment of Religion is, to keep up the apprehenſion of this diſtance between him and them. Now it is hardly poſſible to keep it up, if in the Publick Offices of Religion, in the ſolemneſt poſtures of Devotion, with Eyes lifted up to Heaven, they do make Addreſſes, both to God and to his Creatures.

3. Men are ſure, when they pray to others on Earth to pray for them, that they do no more than they can juſtifie in point of Diſcretion, when they ſpeak or write to thoſe that can underſtand what their deſire is: But no man on Earth can be certain that the Saints in Heaven can do it: For it is agreed they cannot do it without Revelation, and no Man can be aſſured there is a Revelation; and it is not reaſonable to expect it; for they pray to Saints to pray to God for them, and they cannot tell what they pray for, unleſs God to whom they are to pray, reveal to them what it is they muſt pray to him for. Is it not then the better, the ſafer, the wiſer way, to make our Prayers to him, who we are ſure is able to hear and help us; and hath promiſed to grant what we ask in his Son's Name? But there is no *other Name*, either *under Heaven*, or *in Heaven*, whereby *we can be ſaved*, or our Prayers accepted, but his alone.

But our Author ſaith, *It is no part of his Faith, how the Saints in Heaven know the Prayers and Neceſſities of ſuch who addreſs themſelves to them.*

But how comes it to be any part of his Faith, that they know them? *However he doth not doubt but God can never want means of letting the Saints know them.* And is this a ſufficient ground for ſolemn Invocation of Saints? God doth not want Means to let the Emperor of *Japan* know a Requeſt any one here hath to make to him; but is this a reaſonable Ground, for him at this diſtance to make it to him?

God doth not want Means to let the Pope know what a mighty Service it would be to the Chriſtian World, to make a wiſe and truly Chriſtian-Reformation in the Church; but would this be a Ground ſufficient for me at this Diſtance, to make a Speech to him about it? I knew a Man who underſtood not a word of Latin, but yet would needs go to hear a Latin Sermon: ſome asked him afterwards, what he meant by it; and the chief Reaſon he gave was much like this, *God did not want Means to let him know what the Preacher meant:*

But after all, Suppoſe *God ſhould make known to the Saints what is deſired of them*; I ask, Whether this be ſufficient Ground for ſolemn Invocation, when *Socinus* was not able to defend the *Invocation of Chriſt himſelf*, ſuppoſing that he could know our Hearts only by Relation? And he had nothing material to ſay, but only that there was a Command for it; which can never be ſo much as pretended in this Caſe.

As to what he alledges of *the Elders falling down before the Lamb, having Vials full of Odours, which are the Prayers of the Saints*, *Apoc.* 5. 8. It muſt be ſtrained hard to be brought to this purpoſe, when both Ancient and Modern Interpreters take it for a Repreſentation of what was done upon Earth, and not in Heaven. And if it were in Heaven, Prophetical Viſions were never intended for a Meaſure of our Duties. *If the Angels do pray for Mankind*, Zech. 1. 12. Doth it therefore follow we muſt pray to them? But we ſay as the Angel did to S. *John*, Revel. 19. 10. in a like Caſe; *See thou do it not: worſhip God.*

III. Of Addreſſing more Supplications to the *Virgin Mary* than to Chriſt.

HE *believes the Virgin* Mary *to be much more powerful in Heaven than Chriſt, and that ſhe can* command *him to do what ſhe thinks good: And for This reaſon he honours her much more than he does her Son, or*

HE believes it damnable to think the *Virgin Mary* more powerful in Heaven than Chriſt; Or that ſhe can in any thing *command* him. He honours her indeed, as one that was choſen to be the *Mother of God,*

and

God the Father; *For* one *Prayer he says to God, saying* ten *to the Holy Virgin.*

and *bleſſed amongſt all Women*: And believes her to be moſt acceptable to God, in her Interceſſion for us: But owning her ſtill as a *Creature*, and that all ſhe has of Excellency or Bliſs, is the *Gift of God*, proceeding from his meer *Goodneſs*. Neither does he at any time ſay even ſo much as *one* Prayer to *her*, but what is directed *more principally* to *God*; becauſe offered up as a thankful Memorial of Chriſt's Incarnation, and an acknowledgment of the *Bleſſedneſs of Jeſus the Fruit of her Womb*. And this without imagining that there's any more diſhonouring of God in his reciting the *Angelical Salutation*, than in the firſt pronouncing it by the Angel *Gabriel* and *Elizabeth*: Or that his frequent Repetition of it is any more an idle Superſtition, than it was in *David* to repeat the ſame words over twenty ſix times in the 136 *Pſalm*.

III. *Of Addreſſing more Supplications to the Virgin* Mary, *than to Chriſt.*

HEre is no need of farther ſtarting the Queſtion, this only relating to the extraordinary Service of the Bleſſed Virgin. And therefore we are preſently to atttend his Motions.

He believes it damnable to think the Virgin Mary *more powerful in Heaven than Chriſt, or that ſhe can in any thing command him.*

But in good earneſt, Is is not damnable, unleſs a man thinks the bleſſed Virgin *more powerful than Chriſt?* Suppoſe one ſhould think her to have *an equal ſhare of Power with Chriſt*; Is this damnable, or not? Is it not ſetting up a Creature equal with God?

But what thinks he then of thoſe who have attributed an univerſal Dominion to her, over Angels, Men, and Devils? What thinks he not only of *Pſalters*, but of a *Creed*, *Litany*, and all the *Hymns* of *Scripture* being applied to her? All which was done by a Canonized Saint in their Church; and the Books printed out of the *Vatican* Manuſcripts, and dedicated to the Pope. And there we find ſomething more than an *Ora pro nobis* in the *Litany*; for there is *Parce nobis, Domina*, Spare us, good Lady: and *Ab omni malo, libera nos, Domina*: From all evil, Good Lady, deliver us.

S. Bonavent. Opuſc. Tom. 1. ad fin.

What

S. Bernardin. *Sen. apud Bernadin. à Buſtis Marial.* Part 12. Serm. 2.

What thinks he of another Canonized Saint, who ſaid, theſe two Propoſitions are both true, *All things are ſubject to God's Command, even the Virgin*; and *all things are ſubject to the Command of the Virgin, even God.* Was this damnable in a Canonized Saint?

What thinks he of the noted Hymn?

O felix Puerpera noſtra pians ſcelera

Jure Matris impera Redemptori!

Was not this damnable? And I have not only ſeen it in the *old Paris Miſſal*, but *Balinghem* a Jeſuit, ſaith, it was in the Miſſals of *Tournay*, *Liege*, *Amiens*, *Artois*, and the *Old Roman*. I could produce many other Paſſages cited by him out of the *old Offices* to the ſame purpoſe; but I forbear.

Balinghem *Parnaſſ. Marian.* p. 208.

But I cannot omit the Approbation given to the blaſphemous ſaying of St. *Bernardin* by *Mendoza*, (who endeavours to prove *the bleſſed Virgin's Kingdom, not to be a Metaphorical, but a true and real Kingdom*). And by *Salazar*, another noted Jeſuit, who ſaith, *Her Kingdom is as large as her Son's.* And we have lately ſeen how far this Divinity is ſpread, for not many years ſince, this Propoſition was ſent from *Mexico*,

Mendoza. *Virid. Sacr. l.* 2. Probl. 1. & 4. Salazar *pro Immac. Concept. c.* 32.

Filius non tantum tenetur audire Matrem, ſed & obedire;

The Son is bound not only to hear, but to obey his Mother. And is it ſtill damnable for to ſay, *ſhe commands him?*

Hier. perez de Nueros Lapidicina Sacra Tr. 1. Sect. 12. N. 148.

But our Author ſaith, Whatever eſteem they have for her, *They own her ſtill as a Creature.* Is he ſure of that? What thinks he of another ſaying, which *Mendoza* approves of, *viz.* of Chriſt's ſaying to his Mother, *As thou haſt communicated Humanity to me, I will communicate my Deity to thee?*

Viridar. Sacr. l. 2. Probl. 2. N. 11.

But it may be ſaid, *We are by no means to judge the ſenſe of a Church by ſome mens extravagant ſayings.*

I grant it. But I have ſomething conſiderable to reply; *viz.* That we may eaſily judge which way the Guides of that Church incline, by this following paſſage: About ten years ſince a Gentleman of that Communion publiſhed a Book, called, *Wholſome Advice to the Worſhippers of the Bleſſed Virgin*, and

and the whole design of it, being Printed in Latin and French, was to bring the people of that Church to a bare *Ora pro nobis* to the *Blessed Virgin*. But this was so far from being approved, that the Book was condemned at *Rome*, and vehemently opposed by the Jesuits in *France*; and a whole Volume published against it.

La veritable Devotion envers la S. Vierge Etable & Defendu par le pere Crasset à Paris, *A. D.* 1679.

Here I have reason to enquire, Whether the Virgin *Mary* then, according to the sense of the Church of *Rome*, be only a *Mediatrix* of *Intercession* or not, since so large Power and Dominion is attributed to her? And why should not her Suppliants go beyond an *Ora pro nobis*, if this Doctrine be received; as it must be, if the contrary cannot be endured? For that Author allowed her *Intercession*, and *Prayer to her* on that account; but he found fault with those who said *she had a Kingdom divided with her Son*; *that she was the Mother of Mercy, or was a Co-Saviour, or Co-Redemptrix*; *or that she was to be worshipped with* Latria; *or that men were to be slaves to her*. Now, if these things must not be touched without Censure, and no Censure pass on the other Books; it is not easy to judge, which is more agreeable to the Spirit of the Guides of that Church?

Monita Salutaria B. V. Mariæ ad Cultores suos indiscretos §. 3. *n.* 56. §. 4.

But we have a fresh Instance of this kind at home, in a Book very lately published; *Permissu Superiorum*. There we are told in the Epistle, That not only *the Blessed Virgin is the Empress of Seraphims* —— *the most exact Original of Practical Perfection which the Omnipotency of God ever drew*; *but that by innumerable Titles she claims the utmost Duty of every Christian, as a proper Homage to her Greatness*. What can be said more of the Son of God in our Nature? In the Book it self she is said to be *Queen of Angels, Patroness of the Church, Advocate of Sinners*; *that the Power of* Mary *in the Kingdom of Jesus, is suitable to her Maternity, and other Priviledges of Grace*; *and therefore by it she justly claims a servitude from all pure Creatures*. But wherein doth this *special Devotion* to her consist? He names several Particulars.

Contemplations of the Life and Glory of Holy *Mary*, the Mother of Jesus, A. D. 1685.

Pag. 4.

Pag. 8.

1. *In having an inward, cordial and passionate value of the Maternity of* Mary, *and all other Excellencies proper to, and inseparable from the Mother of God.*

2. *In External Acts of Worship, of eminent Servitude towards her, by reason of the Amplitude of her Power in the Empire of Jesus.*

ſus. And can we imagine theſe ſhould go no farther, than a poor *Ora pro nobis*? He inſtances in theſe External Acts of her Worſhip. (1.) *Frequent viſiting holy Places dedicated to her Honour.* And are not thoſe her Temples then? which *Bellarmine* confeſſes to be a peculiar part of the worſhip due to God. And the diſtinction of *Baſilicæ* cannot hold here: becauſe he believes the Aſſumption of the Bleſſed Virgin; and he will not pretend *to her Honour* is only for Diſcrimination. (2.) *A ſpecial Reverence towards Images repreſenting her Perſon.* (3.) *Performing ſome daily Devotions containing her Praiſes, congratulating her Excellency, or imploring her Mediation: and by oft calling upon the Sacred Name of Holy* Mary, *&c.*

Bellarm. *de Cultu Sanct. l.* 3. *c.* 4. *inſ.*

(3.) *In having a firm and unſhaken Confidence in her Patronage amidſt the greateſt of our outward Conflicts, and outward Tribulations; through a ſtrong Judgment of her eminent Power within the Empire of Jeſus, grounded upon the ſingular Prerogative of her Divine Maternity.* I have not Patience to tranſcribe more, but refer the Reader to the Book it ſelf; only the eighth Particular of *ſpecial Devotion* is ſo remarkable, that it ought not to be paſſed over, *viz. Entring a ſolemn Covenant with Holy* Mary, *to be for ever her Servant, Client and Devote under ſome ſpecial Rule, Society, or Form of Life, and thereby dedicating our Perſons, Concerns, Actions, and all the Moments and Events of our Life to Jeſus, under the Protection of his Divine Mother, chooſing her to be our Adoptive Mother, Patroneſs and Advocate; and intruſting her with what we are, have, or do hope, in Life, Death, and through all Eternity.* And is all this no more than an *Ora pro nobis*? And it follows, *Put your ſelf wholly under her Protection.* What a pitiful thing was the old *Collyridian* Cake, in compariſon of theſe ſpecial Acts of Devotion to her! But there are ſome extraordinary ſtrains of Devotion afterwards, which it is pity to paſs over. As, *I will ever obſerve thee as my Sovereign Lady, Adoptive Mother, and moſt Powerful Patroneſs; relying on thy Bowels of Mercy, in all my Wants, Petitions, and Tribulations of Body and Mind.* Could any thing greater be ſaid to the Eternal Son of God? And in the *Praiſe:*

Pag. 12.

Pag. 14.

Pag. 22.

Verſ. Open my Lips, O Mother of Jeſus.
Reſp. *And my Soul ſhall ſpeak forth thy Praiſe.*

Verſ.

Verſ. Divine Lady, be intent to my Aid.

Reſp. *Graciouſly make haſte to help me.*

Verſ. Glory be to Jeſus and *Mary.*

Reſp. *As it was, is, and ever ſhall be.*

Then follows the Eighth *Pſalm*, applied thus to her.

Mary, *Mother of Jeſus, how wonderful is thy Name, even* Pag. 24.
unto the Ends of the Earth!

All Magnificence be given to Mary, *and let her be exalted above the Stars and Angels.*

Reign on high as Queen of Seraphims and Saints; and be thou crowned with Honour and Glory, &c.

Glory be to Jeſus and Mary, &c.

In the next Page, follows a *Cantique* in imitation of the *Te Deum.*

Let us praiſe thee, O Mother of Jeſus! Let us acknowledge Pag. 25.
thee our Sovereign Lady.

Let Men and Angels give Honour to thee, the firſt conceived of all pure Creatures, &c.

I think I need mention no more; only three things I ſhall obſerve; (1.) That this is now printed *Permiſſu Superiorum*; and we thank them for the ſeaſonableneſs of it, in helping us in *true Repreſenting*, what their allowed Doctrines and Practices are. (2.) That this is publiſhed in Engliſh, that our People, as well as theirs, may be convinced how far we have been from unjuſt charging them as to ſuch things as theſe. (3.) That at the ſame time they plead for keeping the Bible out of the hands of the People, wherein their Diſcretion is ſo far to be commended, ſince the Scripture, and this new Scheme of Devotion, can never ſtand together. There being not one word in the Bible towards it, but very much againſt it; and the Pſalms and Hymns muſt be *burleſq'd* to ſound that way.

But what ſaith our Author to their *Roſaries*, wherein there are *ten Ave Maries to one Pater noſter*; which is accounted a ſpecial piece of Devotion; and great things are ſaid of the Effects of it by *Alanus de Rupe*, and many others.

1. As to the *Ave Maries*, he ſaith, *there is no more Diſhonour to God in reciting the Angelical Salutation, than in the firſt pronouncing it by the Angel* Gabriel *and* Elizabeth. But it may not be altogether ſo pertinent. But doth he really

think they said the whole *Ave Maria*, as it is used among them? Did the Angel and *Elizabeth* say, *Sancta Maria, Mater Dei, ora pro nobis peccatoribus, nunc & in hora mortis nostræ?* If not, to what purpose are they mentioned here?

2. As *to the Repetition*; that, he saith, *is no more an idle Superstition, than* David's *repeating the same words 26 times in the* 136 *Psalm.* But what is this to the Question, *why more Supplications to the blessed Virgin than to Christ?* And not one word of Answer is given to it. But *Alanus de Rupe* answers it roundly, *Because the blessed Virgin is our Mediatrix to Christ, the Mother of Mercy, and the special Patroness of Sinners.* This is indeed true representing.

Alanus de Rupe de usu Psalterii, l. 1. c. 6.

IV. Of paying Divine Worship to Relicks.

HE *believes a kind of Divinity to remain in the* Relicks *of his reputed Saints, and therefore adores their rotten Bones, their corrupted flesh, their old Rags, with* Divine *Honour*; *kneeling down to them, kissing them, and going in Pilgrimage to their Shrines and Sepulchres. And he is so far possess'd with a conceited Deity lying hid in those* senseless Remains, *that he foolishly believes they work greater Miracles, and raise more to life, than ever Christ Himself did.*

HE believes it damnable to think there's any Divinity in the Relicks of Saints, or to adore them with Divine Honour, or to pray to their rotten Bones, old Rags or Shrines, or that they can work any strange Cures or Miracles, by any hidden Power of their own. But he believes it good and lawful to keep them with a Veneration, and give them a Religious *honour and respect.* And this he thinks due to them, in as much as knowing himself oblig'd to respect and honour God Almighty from his heart; he looks upon himself also oblig'd to respect and honour every thing that has any particular *Relation* to him: But this with an *inferiour* Honour; as the *Jews* did to the Ark, to the Tables of the Law, to *Moses*'s Rod, to the Temple, to the Priests: So we generally allow to the *Bible*, because it contains *Gods Word*; to the *Church*, because it is *Gods House*; to Holy Men and Priests, because they are *Gods Servants.* And so he does to *Relicks*, because they appertain to *Gods Favourites*; and being insensible things, are yet very sensible *Pledges*, and lively *Memorials* of Christ's Servants, dead indeed to us, but alive with him in Glory. And more especially, because God himself has been pleas'd to honour them, by making them *Instruments* of many evident *Miracles*

h:

he has visibly work'd by them; as is manifest upon undeniable Record. And this he believes as easie for God Almighty now, and as much redounding to the honour of his holy Name, as it was in the *Old Law*, to work such miraculous effects by *Moses*'s *Rod*, by *Gideon*'s *Trumpets*, by *Elia*'s *Mantle*, after he was taken up into Heaven, (*2 Kings* 2. 14.) *Elisæus*'s *Bones*, (*2 Kings* 13. 21.) and infinite other such like *insensible Things*: And also in the *New Law*, by the *Hem* of his own Garment, (*Mat.* 9.21.) by the *Shadow* of St. *Peter*, (*Acts* 5. 15.) by the *Napkins* and *Handkerchiefs* that had but touch'd the Body of S. *Paul*, casting out Devils, and curing Diseases, (*Acts* 19. 12.) and such like. And thus by having a Veneration and Respect for these, he honours God: And does not doubt, but that they that contemn and profane these, do the like to God, as much as they did, who profan'd the *Bread of Proposition*, the *Temple*, and *Vessels* that belong'd to it.

IV. *Of paying Divine Worship to Reliques.*

FOR the right understanding this Controversie, we are to consider,

1. That there is a due Veneration to the Bodies of Saints and Martyrs, allowed on both sides; and there is an undue Worship of them, which is disowned on both sides. The due Veneration is, a Religious Decency to be observed towards them; which lies in avoiding any thing like Contempt or Dishonour to them, and using all such Testimonies of Respect and Decency, which becomes the Remains of Excellent Persons; provided we are satisfied of their Sincerity, without having recourse to Divine Omnipotency to prove them: which *Ferrandus* the Jesuit runs so much to, to prove the Truth of many Reliques, worshipped in the Church of *Rome* in many places at once. But that it is possible to exceed in the Worship of true Reliques, even *Bellarmine* confesseth, who says, *that God took away the Body of* Moses, *lest the People should give Divine Worship to it.* And S. *Jerom*, as hot as he was against *Vigilantius*, yet he utterly denied giving any Adoration to the Reliques of Martyrs. It seems then it is very possible to exceed that way.

Ferrandi *Disquisitio Reliquiaria.*

De Imag. sanct. l. 2. *c.* 4.

2. The Question then is, Whether those Acts of Worship which are allowed in the Church of *Rome*, do not go beyond due Veneration? For it is unreasonable to suppose those who give it, to believe those Reliques to be Gods;

and therefore it must be such a Worship as is given to them, supposing them to be only Reliques of such Persons. The Council of *Trent* decrees Honour and Veneration to be given to them, but never determines what is due, and what not: it forbids all Excesses in drinking and eating, in the visiting of Reliques; but not a word of Excesses in worshipping of them, unless it be comprehended under the name of Superstition. But *Superstition* lies in something forbidden, according to their notion of it: therefore, if there be no Prohibition by the Church, there can be no Superstition in the Worship of them. And if they had thought there had been any in the known Practices of the Church, they would certainly have mentioned them; and because they did not, we ought in reason to look on them as allowed. And yet not only *Cassander* complains of the great Superstition about them; but even the *Wollenbergii* lately confess, that the abuses therein have not only been offensive to us, but to themselves too.

Cassand. Consult. Art. 21. *Tract. special.* 4. *Controv.* 4.

But what saith our *Representer* to them?

He believes it damnable to think there's any Divinity in the Reliques of Saints, or to adore them with Divine Honour. But what is this adoring them with Divine Honour? A true Representer ought to have told us what he meant by it, when the whole Controversie depends upon it. Is it only saying Mass to Reliques, or believing them to be Gods? Is there no giving Divine Honour by Prostration, burning of Incense, *&c.* Nothing in expecting help from them? Yes, *If it be from any hidden Power of their own.* But here is a very hard Question: If a Man doth not believe it to be an intrinsick Power in the Reliques, may a Man safely go to them. *Opis impetrandæ causâ*, as the Council of *Trent* saith, in hopes of Relief from them? Is it not possible for the Devil to appear with *Samuel*'s true Body, and make use of the Reliques of a Saint to a very bad end? Then, say I, no Reliques can secure Men against the Imposture of Evil Spirits, who, by God's Permission, may do strange things with the very Reliques of Saints.

But God hath visibly worked by them, saith our Author, *by making them Instruments of many Miracles; and it is as easie for him to do it now.* This is the force of all he saith. To which I answer.

1. It

1. It is a very bold thing to call in God's Omnipotency, where God himſelf hath never declared he will uſe his Power; for it is under his own Command, and not ours. But there is no Reaſon to deduce the Conſequence of uſing it now, becauſe he hath done it formerly. And that they may not think this is cavilling in us, I deſire them to read *Pere Annat*'s Anſwer to the Janſeniſts pretended Miracle at *Port Royal*, *viz.* of the Cure wrought by one of our Saviour's Thorns. There he gives another account of ſuch Miracles than would be taken from us. But where he ſaith, *It is as much for the Honour of God's Name to work ſuch Miracles now*; their own Authors will tell him the contrary; and that there is no ſuch Reaſon now, as in former times, when Religion was to be confirmed by them; and when Martyrs ſuffered upon the ſole account of the Truth of it; and therefore their Reputation had a greater Influence upon converting the unbelieving World. *Rabat. Joy de Janſeniſt, A.D 1656.*

2. Suppoſe it be granted, yet it proves not any Religious Worſhip to be given to them. For I ſhall ſeriouſly ask an important Queſtion: Whether they do really believe, any greater Miracles have ever been done by Reliques, than were done by the Brazen Serpent? And yet, although that was ſet up by God's own Appointment, when it began to be worſhorſhipped after an undue manner; it was thought fit by *Hezekiah* to be broken in pieces. What now was the undue Worſhip they gave to it? Did they believe the Serpent, which could neither move nor underſtand, was it ſelf a God? *But they did burn Incenſe to it.* And did that make a God of it? Suppoſe Men burn Incenſe to Reliques; What then, are they made Gods preſently? Suppoſe they do not, but place them upon Altars, carry them in Proceſſion, fall down before them, with intention to ſhew the Honour they do them; are not theſe as much as burning a little Incenſe, which could not ſignify ſo much Honour as the other do? and it is hard then to make the one unlawful, and not the other.

V. Of

V. Of the EUCHARIST.

HE believes it *lawful to commit* Idolatry, *and makes it his daily practice to Worſhip and adore a* Breaden God, *giving Divine Honour to thoſe poor empty Elements of* Bread *and* Wine. *Of theſe he asks Pardon for his* ſins; *of theſe he deſires* Grace *and* Salvation; *theſe he acknowledges to have been his Redeemer and Saviour, and hopes for no good but what is to come to him by means of theſe* houſehold Goods. *And then for his Apology, he alledges ſuch groſs contradictions, contrary to all ſenſe and reaſon, that whoſoever will be a* Papiſt, *muſt be no Man: Fondly believing, that what he adores, is no Bread or Wine, but* Chriſt *really preſent under thoſe appearances; and thus makes as many* Chriſts, *as many* Redeemers, *as there are* Churches, Altars, *or* Prieſts. *When, according to Gods Infallible Word, there is but one Chriſt, and He not on Earth, but at the right hand of his* Father *in Heaven.*

HE believes it unlawful to commit Idolatry; and moſt damnable to Worſhip or Adore any *Breaden God*, or to give Divine Honour to any Elements of Bread and Wine. He worſhips only one God, who made Heaven and Earth, and his only Son Jeſus Chriſt our Redeemer; who, being in all things equal to his Father, in Truth and Omnipotency, he believes, made his words good, pronounc'd at his laſt Supper; really giving his Body and Blood to his Apoſtles; the Subſtance of Bread and Wine being by his powerful Words chang'd into his own Body and Blood, the *Species* or Accidents of the Bread and Wine remaining as before. The ſame he believes of the moſt Holy Sacrament of the *Euchariſt*, conſecrated now by Prieſts: That it really contains the Body of Chriſt, which was deliver'd for us; and his Blood, which was ſhed for the remiſſion of ſins: Which being there united with the *Divinity*, he confeſſes *Whole Chriſt* to be preſent. And *him* he adores and acknowledges his *Redeemer*, and not any Bread or Wine. And for the believing of this *Myſtery*, he does not at all think it meet for any Chriſtian to appeal from Chriſt's *Words*, to his own *Senſes* or *Reaſon*, for the examining the truth of what he has ſaid; but rather to ſubmit his *Senſes* and *Reaſon* to Chriſt's *Words* in the obſequiouſneſs of Faith: And that being a Son of *Abraham*, 'tis more becoming him to believe as *Abraham* did, promptly, with a Faith *ſuperiour* to all *Senſe* or *Reaſon*, and whither *theſe* could never lead him. With *this Faith* it is, he believes, every *Myſtery* of his Religion, the *Trinity*, *Incarnation*,

nation, &c. With *this Faith* he believes that what descended upon our *Saviour* at his Baptism in *Jordan*, was really the *Holy Ghost*, though *Senses* or *Reason* could discover it to be nothing but a *Dove*: With this Faith he believes, That the *Man* that *Joshua* saw standing over against him with his Sword drawn, (*Josh.* 5. 13.) and the three Men that *Abraham* entertain'd in the Plains of *Mambre*, (*Gen.* 18.) were really and substantially *no Men*; and that notwithstanding all the information and evidence of *Sense* from their Colour, Features, Proportion, Talking, Eating, and many others, of their being *Men*; yet, without any discredit to his Senses, he really believes they were no such thing, because *God's Word* has assured him of the contrary: And with *this Faith* he believes Christ's *Body and Blood* to be really present in the Blessed Sacrament, though, to all appearance, there's nothing more than Bread and Wine: Thus, not at all hearkning to his *Senses* in a matter where God speaks, he unfeignedly confesses, That he that made the World of nothing by his sole word: That cured Diseases by his Word: That raised the Dead by his Word: That expell'd Devils: That commanded the Winds and Seas: That multiplied Bread: That changed Water into Wine by his Word, and Sinners into Just Men, cannot want Power to *change* Bread and Wine into his own Body and Blood by his *sole Word*. And this without danger of multiplying his Body, of making as many Christs as Altars, or leaving the right hand of his *Father*. But only by giving to his Body a *supernatural* manner of *Existence*; by which, being left without *extension* of parts, and rendred *independent* of place, it may be one and the same in many places at once, and whole in every part of the Symbols, and not obnoxious to any corporeal Contingencies. And this kind of Existence is no more, than what in a manner he bestows upon every *Glorified Body*: Than what his own Body had, when born without the least violation of his Mothers Virginal Integrity: When he arose from the Dead, out of the Sepulchre, without removing the Stone: When he entred amongst his Disciples, the Doors being shut. And though he cannot understand how this is done, yet he undoubtedly believes, That God is able to do more than He is able to understand.

V. *Of the Eucharist.*

THere are two material Points under this Head which are to be examined, because he endeavours to set them off with all the advantage he can, *viz.* Adoration of the Host, and Transubstantiation.

I. *Of*

I. *Of the Adoration of the Hoſt.*

1. The Queſtion is far enough from being, Whether it be lawful to commit Idolatry? as our *Repreſenter* puts it. For the *Miſrepreſenter* ſaith, *That a Papiſt believes it lawful to commit Idolatry:* and to clear this, our Author gravely ſaith, *He believes it unlawful to commit Idolatry*, pag. 9. As though any Men ever owned it to be lawful: Which is, as if the Queſtion were, Whether ſuch a Man committed Adultery, and he ſhould think to clear himſelf by ſaying, he believed it unlawful to commit Adultery.

2. The Queſtion is not, Whether Chriſt may be lawfully adored by us in the Celebration of the Euchariſt; which we are ſo far from denying, that our Church requires our receiving it in the poſture of Adoration.

3. The true Queſtion is, Whether the Body of Chriſt, being ſuppoſed to be preſent in the Hoſt by Tranſubſtantiation, be a ſufficient ground to give the ſame Adoration to the Hoſt, which they would do to the Perſon of Chriſt.

And that this is the true ſtate of the Queſtion, will appear by theſe things.

1. The Council of *Trent* firſt defined Tranſubſtantiation, and from thence inferred *Adoration of the Hoſt*; as is moſt evident to any one that will read the fourth and fifth Decrees of the Thirteenth Seſſion. *Nullus itaque dubitandi locus*, &c. *i. e.* If Tranſubſtantiation be true, then Adoration follows. It's true, the ſixth Canon only ſpeaks of *Chriſt being there worſhipped*; but that ought to be compared with the firſt, ſecond, and fourth Canons, where the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* is fully ſet down, as the Foundation of that *Adoration.*

2. The *Adoration* is not fixed on the *Perſon of Chriſt*, *as ſeparate from the Hoſt*, but as making *one Object* of Worſhip together with it. And ſo the Council of *Trent* declares in the ſixth Decree; when it ſaith, *The Sacrament is nevertheleſs to be adored, becauſe it was inſtituted to be received* This cannot be otherwiſe underſtood, than as relating to the Sacrament: and ſo *that* whatever it be, muſt be granted to be the Object of Adoration. *By the Sacrament, ſaith Cardinal* Pallavicini, *is underſtood the Object made up of the Body of Chriſt, and the Accidents.* The Worſhip then being confeſſed to be Adora-

Pallavicin. *hiſt. Concil. Trident.* l. 12. c. 6.

Adoration, which is due to God alone, and that Adoration directed to the Sacrament as its proper Object; the Question now is, Whether such a Supposition in the Sacrament, doth justifie that Adoration?

Our Author saith, *He accounteth it most damnable to worship or adore any Breaden God, or to give Divine Honour to any Elements of Bread and Wine.*

Then, I say, by his own confession, if it be only Bread, he commits Idolatry; for the Adoration he cannot deny. But our *Representer* loves ambiguous Expressions, which to the People sound very well, but have no sincere meaning: for what is it he understands by his *Breaden God?* If it be that he worships a God, which himself supposes to be nothing but Bread, we do not charge him with it; but if it be what we believe it to be, the Substance of Bread, but himself believes to be turned into the Body of Christ, then he cannot deny his Adoration to be given to it.

All that can excuse them is, the Supposition; and whether that will or not, is now to be consider'd.

1. If it be not true, themselves grant it to be Idolatry. The Testimonies of Bishop *Fisher*, and *Costerus*, are so well known to this purpose, that I shall not repeat them. And *Catharinus*, a Divine of Note in the Council of *Trent*, confesses it is Idolatry to worship an unconsecrated Host, although the Person, through a Mistake, believes it consecrated. And he quotes Saint *Thomas* and *Paludanus* for his Opinion; and gives this Reason for it; *Because Christ is not worshipped simply in the Sacrament, but as he is under the Species; and therefore if he be not so present, a Creature hath Divine Worship given it. As those were guilty of Idolatry, who worshipped any Creatures of old, supposing God to be there, as that he was the Soul of the World. They were not excused,* saith he, *that they thought they worshipped but one God; because they worshipped him as present in such a manner, as he was not.* And this Book of his, he saith, in the Review of it, *was seen and approved by the Pope's Order, by their Divines at* Paris.

Roffens. c. Occolamp. l. 1. c. 2. *Coster. Enchirid.* c. 8. n. 10.

Catharin. in Cajet. p. 133, &c. *Ed. Paris* 1535.

Lugdan. 1542.

2. If *the Bread were taken to be God,* our Author doth not deny it would be Idolatry, for that were to worship a Breaden God. Yet here would be a Mistake, and a gross one; yet this Mistake would not excuse the Persons committing it

from moſt damnable Idolatry, as he confeſſes: Why then ſhould the other Miſtake excuſe them, when they ſuppoſe the Subſtance of the Bread not to be there, but the Body of Chriſt to be under the Species? *Yes*, ſay they, *then no Creature is ſuppoſed to be the Object of Worſhip.* But when the Bread is ſuppoſed to be God, it muſt be ſuppoſed not to be a Creature. There is no Anſwer to be given in this Caſe, *but that the Bread really is a Creature, whatſoever they imagined*; and if this Miſtake did not excuſe, neither can the other.

II. *Of Tranſubſtantiation.*

Three things our Author goes upon, with reſpect to this.

1. He ſuppoſes Chriſt's words to be clear for it.
2. He ſhews the poſſibility of it, from Gods Omnipotency.
3. He argues againſt the Teſtimony or Evidence of Senſe or Reaſon in this Caſe, from ſome parallel Inſtances, as he thinks.

1. *He believes Jeſus Chriſt made his Words good, pronounced at his laſt Supper, really giving his Body and Blood to his Apoſtles? the Subſtance of Bread and Wine being, by his powerful Words, changed into his own Body and Blood; the Species only, or Accidents of the Bread and Wine, remaining as before. The ſame he believes of the Euchariſt conſecrated now by Prieſts.*

This is a very eaſie way, of taking it for granted that the words are clear for Tranſubſtantiation. And from no better Ground, to fly to God's Omnipotency to make it good, is as if one ſhould ſuppoſe Chriſt really to be turned into a Rock, a Vine, a Door; becauſe the words are every jot as clear, and then call in Gods Omnipotency, which is as effectual to make them good. I confeſs, theſe words are ſo far from being clear to me for Tranſubſtantiation, that if I had never heard of it, I ſhould never have thought of it, from theſe or any other words of Scripture, *i. e.* not barely conſidering the ſound of words, but the Eaſtern Idioms of ſpeaking; the Circumſtances of our Saviour's real Body at that time when he ſpake them; the uncouth way of feeding on Chriſt's real Body, without any Objection made againſt it by his Diſciples; the Key our Saviour elſewhere gives for underſtanding the manner of eating his Fleſh; and withal, if theſe words be literally and ſtrictly underſtood, they muſt make the Sub-

Subſtance of Bread to be Chriſt's Body; for that is unavoidably the literal ſenſe of the words. For can any Men take *This* to be any thing but this Bread, who attend to the common ſenſe and meaning of Words, and the ſtrict Rules of Interpretation? Yet this ſenſe will by no means be allow'd; for then all that can be infer'd from theſe words is, that when Chriſt ſpake theſe words, *The Bread was his Body*. But either Chriſt meant the *Bread* by *This*, or he did not; if he did, the former Propoſition is unavoidable in the literal ſenſe; if he did not, then by vertue of theſe words, the Bread could never be turned into the Body of Chriſt. For that only could be made the Body of Chriſt which was meant, when Chriſt ſaid, *This is my Body*. This ſeems to me to be as plain and convincing as any Demonſtration in *Euclid*. Which hath often made me wonder at thoſe who talk ſo confidently of the plain Letter of Scripture, being for this Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation. But ſeveral Divines of the Church of *Rome* underſtood themſelves better, and have confeſſed, that this Doctrine could not be drawn out of the literal ſenſe of theſe words; as it were eaſie to ſhew, if it had not been lately done already. It is enough here to obſerve, that *Vaſquez* confeſſeth it of *Scotus*, *Durandus*, *Paludanus*, *Ockam*, *Cameracenſis*; and himſelf yields that they do not, and cannot ſignifie expreſly the Change of the Bread and Wine into the Body of Chriſt. For how can, *This is my Body*, literally ſignifie, this is changed into my Body? If that Propoſition were literally true, *This is my Body*, it overthrows the Change; For how can a thing be changed into that which it is already?

Vaſq. in 3 *part. Diſc.* 180. *Q.* 75 *Art.* 2. *c.* 5.

2. *He believes Chriſt being equal to his Father in Truth and Omnipotency, can make his words good.* We do not in the leaſt diſpute Chriſt's Omnipotency, but we may their familiar way of making uſe of it to help them out, when Senſe and Reaſon fail them. And therefore *Cajetan* well ſaid; *We ought not to diſpute about Gods Abſolute Power in the Doctrine of the Sacraments, being things of ſuch conſtant uſe; and that it is a fooliſh thing to attribute to the Sacrament all that God can do.*

Cajetan. in 3 *Part. Q.* 75. *Art.* 1, 2, 3.

But we muſt conſider what he ſaith againſt *Senſe and Reaſon*. *For the believing this Myſtery, he does not at all think it meet for any Chriſtian to appeal from Chriſts Words, to his own*

Senſes or Reaſon, for the examining the Truth of what he hath ſaid, but rather to ſubmit his Senſes and Reaſon to Chriſt's Words in the obſequiouſneſs of Faith. What! whether we know this to be the meaning of Chriſt's Words, or not? And thus we ſhall be bound to ſubmit to every abſurd Interpretation of Scripture, becauſe we muſt not uſe our Senſes or Reaſon for examining the Truth of what is ſaid there. Can any thing be plainer ſaid in Scripture, than that God hath Eyes and Ears, and Hands? Muſt now every Man yield to this *in the obſequiouſneſs of Faith*, without examining it by Principles of common Reaſon? And we think we are therefore bound to put another Senſe upon thoſe Expreſſions, becauſe they imply a Repugnancy to the Divine Perfections. Why not then where ſomething is implied which is repugnant to the Nature of Chriſt's Body, as well as to our Senſes? But the Queſtion about judging in this matter by our Senſes, is not, as our Author is willing to ſuppoſe, *viz.* Whether our Senſes are to be believed, againſt a clear and expreſs Divine Revelation; but whether the Judgment of our Senſes and Reaſon is not to be made uſe of for finding out the true ſenſe of this Revelation? And we think there is great reaſon for it.

(1.) Becauſe we have no more certain way of judging the Subſtance of a Body, than by our Senſes. We do not ſay our Senſes go beyond the Accidents; but we ſay, our Senſes, by thoſe Accidents, do aſſure us of the bodily Subſtance, or elſe it were impoſſible for us to know there is any ſuch thing in the world.

(2.) Becauſe Chriſt did himſelf appeal to the Judgment of his Diſciples Senſes concerning the Truth of his own Body after the Reſurrection; *Behold my Hands and my Feet,* S. Luk. 24. 39. *that it is I my ſelf: handle and ſee, for a Spirit hath not Fleſh and Bones, as ye ſee me have.* Now we think we have reaſon to allow the ſame *Criterion* which Chriſt himſelf did about the very ſame Body. Unleſs he had then told his Diſciples, that there was to be *another ſupernatural manner of Exiſtence* of the ſame Body, concerning which their Senſes were not to be Judges.

(3.) Some of the moſt important Articles of the Chriſtian Faith do ſuppoſe the Judgment of our Senſes to be true. As about the Truth of Chriſt's Body; whether he had really

ally a Body, or only the outward Accidents and Appearance of a Body? if he had not, he did not really ſuffer upon the Croſs, and ſo the Sacrifice of Propitiation there offered up to the Father for the ſins of mankind, is loſt. There was a great Controverſy in St. *John*'s time, and afterwards, Whether Chriſt had any real Body? Thoſe who denied it, brought Revelation for it; thoſe who aſſerted it, proved it by their Senſes, as S. *John* himſelf, *That which we have ſeen, and heard, and our hands have handled, &c.* He doth not tell men, they muſt ſubmit their Senſe and Reaſon to the pretence of Revelation; but they ought to adhere to the Judgment of their Senſes concerning the Reality of Chriſt's Body. Since therefore Chriſt himſelf appealed to it, the Apoſtles made uſe of it, without any caution or limitation, we have great reaſon to rely ſtill on the Judgment of our Senſes concerning the ſame Object, *viz.* the Body of Chriſt. 1 S. Joh. 1. 1, 3.

3. But we muſt now conſider his Inſtances to overthrow the Iudgment of our Senſes and Reaſon in this Point.

1. *He believes Chriſt to be God, though to Senſes he ſeemed nothing but Man.* Do we ever pretend to judge of Chriſt's Divinity by our Senſes? How then can this be pertinent, when our only Diſpute is about judging his Body, and the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine by them? And yet the Senſes were of great uſe as to the proof of his Divinity by the Miracles which he wrought? which if they had been like the pretended Miracles in Tranſubſtantiation, could have convinced no man, becauſe they could never ſee them.

2. *He believes the Holy Ghoſt deſcended on our Saviour, tho Senſes or Reaſon could diſcover it to be nothing but a Dove.* If there were no reaſon to judge otherwiſe, the Judgment of Senſe were to be followed: but ſince the Scripture declares it was the Holy Ghoſt deſcending as a Dove, we have no reaſon to queſtion that Revelation. For we do not pretend that our Senſes are ſo far Judges of Divine Appearances, as to exclude the poſſibility of God's aſſuming the ſhape and figure of his Creature when he pleaſes, by moulding the ſubſtance of a real Body into ſuch a Repreſentation. Thus we do not deny the poſſibility of an appearance of the Holy Ghoſt under Bread and Wine, if God thought fit, any more than under a Dove; and in this Caſe we do not pretend

that

that our Senſes can exclude the preſence of a Spirit under the Elements; but that is very different from the preſent Caſe, for here the Subſtance is ſuppoſed to be gone, and nothing but Accidents remaining; and no ſpiritual Preſence of Chriſt is denied, but that of his Body, the very ſame Body which ſuffered on the Croſs.

3. *He believes the Man who appeared to* Joſhua, (*ch.* 5 13.) *and the three Men to* Abraham, (Gen. 18.) *were really and ſubſtantially no Men, notwithſtanding all the Information and Evidence of Senſe to the contrary, from their Colour, Features, Proportion, Talking, Eating, and many others.* And what follows from hence, but that Spiritual Inviſible Subſtances may be under the appearance of Bodies, and that our Senſes cannot be Judges of them? Which is not our Queſtion, but Whether Bodies can be ſo preſent after the manner of Spirits, as to loſe all the natural Properties of Bodies? and whether a Material Subſtance can be loſt, under all the Accidents proper to it, ſo as our Senſes cannot be proper Judges of one by the other?

But our Author ſeems to grant this, in a natural way of the Exiſtence of a Body: but he ſaith, *Chriſt gives to his Body a ſupernatural manner of Exiſtence, by which being left without extenſion of Parts, and rendred independent of Place, it may be one and the ſame in many places at once, and whole in every part of the Symbols, and not obnoxious to any corporeal contingencies.*

This is to me a Myſtery beyond all comprehenſion by Senſe or Reaſon; and there is certainly a great difference between governing our Underſtandings, and giving them up, as we muſt do if this Doctrine hold good; for it overthrows any fixed Principles of Reaſon in mankind concerning the Nature and Properties of Bodies.

For, 1. We muſt ſtill ſuppoſe the Body of Chriſt to be the very ſame individual Body which ſuffered upon the Croſs; but if it had no extenſion of Parts, and be reckoned independent upon Place, it ceaſeth to be a Body. It is granted, that after a natural way of Exiſtence, a Body cannot be in more places than one: but let the way of Exiſtence be what it will, if it be a body, it muſt be finite; if finite, it muſt be limited and circumſcribed; if it be circumſcribed within one place, it cannot be in more places, for that is to make it circum-

cumſcribed, and not circumſcribed; undivided from it ſelf, and divided from it ſelf at the ſame time. Which is a manifeſt Contradiction, which doth not depend only on Quantity or Extenſion, but upon the eſſential Unity of a Body.

2. If it be poſſible for a Body to be in ſeveral places by *a ſupernatural Exiſtence*; why may not the ſame Body be in ſeveral places by *a natural Exiſtence*? Is it not becauſe Extenſion and Circumſcription are ſo neceſſary to it, that in a natural Way it can be but in one Place? Then it follows that theſe are eſſential Properties of Bodies; ſo that no true Body can be conceived without them.

3. This *Supernatural Exiſtence* doth not hinder the Body's being individually preſent in one place: My meaning is this; A Prieſt Conſecrates an Hoſt at *London*, and another at *York*; is the Body of Chriſt at *London*, ſo preſent there by virtue of Conſecration, as to be preſent at *York* too, by this *Supernatural Exiſtence*? What then doth the Conſecration at *York* produce? If it be not, then its Preſence is limited to the Hoſt, where the Conſecration is made; and if it be ſo limited, then this *ſupernatural Exiſtence* cannot take off its relation to place.

4. The ſame Body would be liable to the greateſt Contradictions imaginable: For the ſame Body after this *ſupernatural way of Exiſtence*, may not only be above and below, within and without, near and far off from it ſelf: but it may be hot and cold, dead and alive; yea, in Heaven and Hell at once.

5. What is it that makes it ſtill a Body after this *ſupernatural way of Exiſtence*, &c. if it loſe extenſion and dependency on place? If it be only an aptitude to extenſion, when that *ſupernatural Exiſtence* is taken off, then it muſt either be without quantity, or with it. If it be without quantity, how can it be a Body? if with quantity, how is it poſſible to be without Extenſion?

6. This confounds all the differences of Greater and Leſs, as well as of Diſtance and Nearneſs. For upon this Suppoſition, a thing really greater may be contained within a leſs: for the whole Organical Body of Chriſt, with all its parts, may be brought within the compaſs of a Wafer; and the whole be in every part without any diſtance between Head and Feet.

7. This

7. This makes Christ to have but one Body, and yet to have as many Bodies as there are consecrated Hosts. No, saith our Author, *This supernatural manner of Existence is without danger of multiplying his Body, or making as many Christs as Altars.* But how this can be, is past all humane Understanding: For every Consecration hath its Effect, which is supposed to be the Conversion of the Substance of the Bread into the Body of Christ. Now, when a Priest at *London* converts the Bread into the Body of Christ there, he doth it not into the Body of Christ at *York*, but the Priest there doth it; therefore the Body of Christ at *London*, is different from that at *York*; or else the Conversion at *London* would be into the Body, as at *York*. But if not, what is the substantial Term of this substantial Change, where nothing but an accidental Mode doth follow? If there be any such Term, whether that must not be a production of something which was not before; and if it be so, Christ must have as many new Bodies, as there are Consecrations.

8. This makes that which hath no particular Subsistence of its own, to be the Subject of a substantial Change; for this is the condition of Christ's Body, whatever its manner of Existence be, after the Hypostatical Union to the Divine Nature. For, when *Bellarmin*, *Petavius*, and others of their greatest Divines, undertake, against *Nestorius*, to explain the Hypostatical Union, they tell us it consists in this, that the human Nature loseth its proper Subsistence, and is assumed into the Subsistence of the Divine Nature. From whence I infer, That the Body of Christ, having no proper Subsistence of its own, there can be no substantial Change into that which hath no proper subsistence, but into that which hath; and consequently the Change must be into the Divine Nature principally; from whence it will follow, the Elements losing their Subsistence, upon Consecration the Divinity must be united hypostatically to them, as to the human Nature; and so there will be as many Hypostatical Unions, as there are Consecrations. And so this Doctrine not only confounds Sense and Reason, but the Mysteries of Christ's Incarnation too: Which I think is sufficient for this Head.

Bellarm. *de Incarn. l.*3.*c.*8. Petav. *de Incarnatione p.*6. *c.* 1. §. 3.

VI *Of*

VI. Of Merits and Good Works.

HE believes Chriſt's Death and Paſſion to be ineffectual, and inſignificant, and that he has no dependance upon the merits of his Sufferings, or the Mercy of God for the obtaining Salvation; but that he is to be ſav'd by his own Merits. And, for this reaſon he is very zealouſly buſie in faſting, in whipping himſelf, in watching, in going in Proceſſion, in wearing Hair-ſhirts, and uſing a thouſand ſuch like Mortifications: And having done this, he thinks himſelf not at all beholding to God for his Salvation, and that to give him Heaven, will be no favour: It being now his due, upon the account of his own meritorious Atchievements, without any God-a-mercy to Chriſt's Paſſion, or his Makers Goodneſs.

HE believes it damnable to ſay that Chriſt's Death and Paſſion is ineffectual and inſignificant: And that 'tis the Doctrine of Devils to belive, That he has no dependance for his Salvation upon the Merits of Chriſt's Sufferings, or the Mercy of God; but only upon his own Merits and good Works. 'Tis his Faith to believe, That of our ſelves we are not ſufficient, ſo much as to think a good thought, that the Grace by which we are juſtified, is given us purely *gratis* upon the account of Chriſts Merits; moreover, that no Man, how juſt ſoever, can merit any thing, either in this life, or in that to come, independant on the Merits & Paſſion of Jeſus Chriſt. Nevertheleſs, that through the Merits of Chriſt, the good Works of a juſt Man proceeding from Grace, are ſo acceptable to God, that through his *Goodneſs* and *Promiſe*, they are truly *meritorious* of eternal Life. And this he has learn'd from the Apoſtle, (2 *Tim.* 4. 8.) where he is taught, that there is a Crown of Juſtice, which our Lord, a juſt Judge, will render at the laſt day, not only to Saint *Paul*, but alſo to all thoſe, that ſhall have fought a good fight, and conſummated their courſe, kept the Faith, and lov'd his coming. Knowing therefore that at the day of Judgment, he is to receive *according to his Works:* He endeavours by *good Works to make his Vocation and Election ſure.* And in following this Counſel, he thinks he no more offends againſt the fulneſs of the Merits of Chriſt's, or God's Mercy, than the Apoſtle does in giving it.

VI. *Of Merits and good Works.*

FOr the true ſtating this Controverſie, we are to obſerve:

1. That we do not charge thoſe of the Church of *Rome*,

That

That they belive Christ's Death and Paſſion to be ineffectual and inſignificant, and that they have no dependence on the Merits of his Sufferings, or the Mercy of God for attaining Salvation; but that they are to be ſaved only by their own Merits and Good Works; as the Miſrepreſenter ſaith.

2. We do not charge them with denying the *Neceſſity of Divine Grace in order to merit; or with aſſerting that they can merit independently thereupon.*

3. We do by no means diſpute about the *Neceſſity of Good Works*, in order to the Reward of another Life; or aſſert that Chriſt's Merits will ſave Men without *working out their own Salvation*; but do firmly believe, that *God will judg Men according to their Works.*

The Queſtion then is, *Whether the Good Works of a juſt Man*, as our Author expreſſes it, *are truly meritorious of eternal Life?* Which he affirms, but qualifies with ſaying, *That they proceed from Grace, and that through Gods Goodneſs and Promiſe, they are truly meritorious.* But the Council of *Trent denounces an Anathema againſt thoſe who deny the Good Works of juſtified Perſons, to be truly meritorious of the increaſe of Grace, and of eternal Life.*

Concil. Trident Seſſ. 6. Can. 32.

Here then lie the Points in difference, (1.) Whether ſuch Good Works can be ſaid to be *truly meritorious*? (2.) Whether thoſe who deny it, deſerve an *Anathema* for ſo doing? As to what relates to *Gods Acceptance and Allowance, and his Goodneſs and Promiſe*, we freely own all that he ſaith about it; and if no more be meant, what need an *Anathema* about this matter? There muſt therefore be ſomething beyond this, when Good Works are not only ſaid to be *truly meritorious*, but we are curſed if we do not ſay the ſame.

To make any thing *truly meritorious*, we muſt ſuppoſe theſe Conditions requiſite.

1. That what we pretend to merit by, be our own free act.
2. That it be not defective.
3. That there be an Equality between it, and the Reward due to it.
4. That there be an Obligation in point of Juſtice, to give that Reward to him that doth it.

And from theſe Conſiderations, we deny that good Works, even of juſtified Perſons, can be *truly meritorious.*

1. It

1. It is granted by themſelves, That what is *truly meritorious*, muſt be a free Act of the Perſon who doth it. Now the good Works of juſtified perſons cannot be ſaid to be their own free Acts, if the Power of doing them depend upon Divine Aſſiſtance, and there was an antecedent Obligation upon them to perform them: So that they can do nothing but what they are bound to, as God's Creatures; and their very Power of doing it is from the Grace of God. If Men pretended to merit at anothers hands by what God gives, there were ſome colour for it; but to merit from God himſelf by what he gives us, ſeems very incongruous. If I ow a Man an 100 *l.* and another knowing me unable to pay it, gives me ſo much to pay the Debt, this is no more than what may be called ſtrict Payment, as to the Creditor; but if the Creditor himſelf gives me this 100 *l.* to pay himſelf with, will any Man call this ſtrict Payment? He may call it ſo himſelf, if he pleaſes, but that only ſhews his Kindneſs and Favour; but it doth not look very modeſtly or gratefully, for the Debtor to inſiſt upon it as *true legal Payment*. Juſt ſo it is in good Works done by the Power of God's Grace, which we could never have done without it; and therefore ſuch cannot be *truly meritorious*.

Meritum eſt actio libera cui Merces debetur ex juſtitiâ. Cofter. *Enchirid. de Meritis bon. Oper. c.* 7.

In quantum homo propriâ voluntate facit id quod debet, meretur apud Deum, alioquin reddere debitum non eſſet meritorum. Aquin. 1, 2. *qu.* 114. *artic.* 1. *reſp. ad.* 1.

2. What is *truly meritorious* muſt not be defective; becauſe the Proportion is to be equal between the Act, and the Reward due to it; which being perfect, requires that there be do Defect in the Acts which merit it. But this can never be ſaid of Good Works of juſtified Perſons, that they have no Defects in them. We do not ſay, they are not Good Works, but they are not exact and perfect: for although the Grace of God, as it comes from him, be a perfect Gift; yet as it acts upon Mens Minds, it doth not raiſe them to ſuch a degree, but that they have Imperfections in their beſt Actions. And whatever is defective, is faulty; whatever is faulty, muſt be forgiven: whatever needs forgiveneſs, cannot be *truly meritorious*. But not only their Good Works are defective; but if they would merit, they ought to have none but Good Works, whereas the mixture of others renders the good uncapable of being *meritorious*, becauſe there is ſo much to be pardoned, as takes away all claim of *Merit* in the good they perform. And themſelves do not pre-

tend, that Men can merit the Grace of Remiſſion; but it is very ſtrange that thoſe who cannot deſerve to be forgiven, ſhould deſerve to have an infinite Reward beſtowed upon them.

Meritum ſe habet ad præmium ſicut pretium ad illud quod emitur. Altiſiodor. l. 3. tr. 12.

Abſoluta æqualitas inter mercedem & meritum ponitur per modum Juſtitiæ commutativæ. Bell. Juſtiſ. l. 5. c. 14.

3. There muſt be an exact Proportion between the Act and the Recompence: for to merit, is to pay a Price for a thing; and in ſuch Acts of commutative Juſtice, there muſt be an Equality of one thing with another. But what Equality can there be between the imperfect Good Works of the beſt Men, and the moſt perfect Happineſs of another World, eſpecially when that conſiſts in the fruition of the Beatifical Viſion? For what Proportion can there be between our Acts towards God, and God's Acts towards the Bleſſed in Heaven? Let the Acts be of what Perſon ſoever, or of what Nature ſoever, or from what Principle ſoever; as long as they are the Acts of finite imperfect Creatures, it is impoſſible there ſhould be any Equality, or exact Proportion between them and the Eternal Favour of God, which is the Reward promiſed.

4. Where Acts are *truly meritorious*, there follows an Obligation of ſtrict Juſtice, to pay the Recompence due to them. But what ſtrict Juſtice can there be between the Creator and his Creatures, to recompence the Service they are bound to perform; when their very Being, Power to act, Aſſiſtance in acting, and Recompence for it, are all from his Bounty and Goodneſs? But our Author would avoid all this, by ſaying, that though Good Works are *truly meritorious*; yet it is *through the Merits of Chriſt, and as they proceed from Grace, and through his Goodneſs and Promiſe that they are ſo*; *i. e.* they are truly meritorious, becauſe it appears from all theſe things they neither are, nor can be meritorious. For,

(1.) How come the Merits of Chriſt to make good Works *truly meritorious*? Are the Merits of Chriſt imputed to thoſe Good Works? Then thoſe Good Works muſt be as meritorious as Chriſt's own Works; which I ſuppoſe he will not aſſert. Or, is it that Chriſt hath merited the Grace whereby we may merit? But even this will not make our perſonal Acts truly meritorious; and the Nature of Merit relates to the Acts, and not to the Power.

(2.) How

2. How comes the Power of Grace to make them *truly meritorious*; when the Power of Grace doth ſo much increaſe the Obligation on our ſide? If it be ſaid, *That the ſtate of Grace puts men into a capacity to merit:* we might more reaſonably infer the contrary, that it puts them out of a capacity of meriting; becauſe the Remiſſion of Sins, and the Favour of God, are things for which we can never make him any recompence.

(3.) How comes a Divine Promiſe to make Acts truly meritorious? For God's Promiſe is an Act of meer kindneſs, which is very different from ſtrict Juſtice: and although by the Promiſe God binds himſelf to performance; yet how come thoſe Acts to be more meritorious of Heaven, than the Acts of Repentance are of Remiſſion of Sins? Yet none will now ſay, that there can be any Acts meritorious of that. Yet certainly there is a clear promiſe of Pardon upon Repentance, as there is of Heaven upon Good Works: And if the Promiſe in the other caſe doth not make Repentance meritorious of Pardon; how can it make Good Works truly meritorious of Eternal Life? But notwithſtanding, we do not deny God's Fidelity to his Promiſe may be called *Juſtice*, and ſo God, as a *Righteous Judge*, may give a *Crown of Righteouſneſs to all that follow St.* Paul's *Example*, without making Good Works to be *truly meritorious.* 2 Tim. 4. 8.

VII. *Of Confeſſion.*

HE *believes it part of his Religion to make Gods of Men; fooliſhly thinking that theſe have power to forgive ſins. And therefore as often as he finds his Conſcience oppreſſed with the guilt of his Offences; he calls for one of his Prieſts, who are commonly more wicked than himſelf, and falling at his feet, he unfolds to him the whole ſtate of his Soul; and having run over a Catalogue of his Sins, he asks of him Pardon and Forgiveneſs. And what is*

HE believes it damnable in any Religion to make Gods of Men. However he firmly holds, that when Chriſt ſpeaking to his Apoſtles, ſaid, (*Joh.* 20. 21.) *Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt; whoſe ſins you ſhall forgive, they are forgiven, and whoſe ſins you ſhall retain, they are retained:* He gave to them, and their Succeſſors, the Biſhops and Prieſts of the Catholick Church, Authority to abſolve any truly penitent ſinner from his

most absurd of all, he is so sillily stupid as to believe, That, if his Ghostly Father, *after he has heard all his Villanies in his Ear, does but pronounce three or four* Latin *words, making the sign of a* Cross *with two fingers and a thumb over his head, his sins are forthwith forgiven him, although he had never any thoughts of amendment, or intention to forsake his wickedness.*

his sins. And God having thus *given them the Ministry of Reconciliation,* and made *them Christ's Legates,* (2 Cor. 5. 18, 19, 12.) *Christ's Ministers, and the Dispensers of the Mysteries of Christ,* and given them *power to loose on Earth whatsoever was to be loosed in Heaven,* (Mat. 18.18.) he undoubtedly believes, that whosoever comes to them making a sincere and humble *confession* of his sins, with a firm purpose of amendment, and an hearty resolution of turning from his evil ways, may from them receive *Absolution,* by the Authority given them from Heaven, and not doubt but God ratifies above, the sentence pronounced in that Tribunal; *Loosing in Heaven whatsoever is thus loosed by them on Earth.* And that, whosoever comes without the due preparation, without a Repentance from the bottom of his heart, and real intension of forsaking his sins, receives no benefit by the *Absolution,* but adds sin to sin, by an high contempt of God's Mercy, and abuse of his Sacraments.

VII. *Of Confession.*

WE do not charge the Church of *Rome,* that in the *power of Absolving, they make Gods of Men,* as our *Misrepresenter pretends.*

2. We do not deny, *That Christ gave to the Bishops and Priests of the Catholick Church, Authority to absolve any truly penitent Sinner from his Sins,* (which he therefore needlessly proves out of Scripture) *and that such Absolution is ratified in Heaven.*

3. We are glad to find that our Author declares, *That no Man receives benefit by Absolution, without Repentance from the bottom of his Heart, and real intention of forsaking his Sins*; by which we hope he means more than Attrition.

But yet there are some things which stick with us, as to the Doctrine and Practicee of the Church of *Rome* in this matter, which he takes no notice of.

1. That Secret Confession of Sins to a Priest, is made so necessary to Salvation, that an *Anathema* is denounced against all that deny it, when they cannot deny that God doth forgive

Sess. 14. *Can.* 6.

give Sins upon true Contrition. For the Council of *Trent* doth ſay, *That Contrition, with Charity, doth reconcile a Man to God before the Sacrament of Penance be actually received.* But then it adds, *That the deſire of Confeſſion is included in Contrition:* Which is impoſſible to be proved by Scripture, Reaſon, or Antiquity. For ſo lately, as in the time of the *Maſter of the Sentences*, and *Gratian* (in the 12*th*. Century) it was a very diſputable Point, whether Confeſſion to a Prieſt were neceſſary. And it is very hard for us to underſtand how that ſhould become neceſſary to Salvation ſince, which was not then. Some of their own Writers confeſs, that ſome good Catholicks did not believe the neceſſity of it. I ſuppoſe the old Canoniſts may paſs for good Catholicks; and yet *Maldonat* ſaith, *That all the Interpreters of the Decrees held, that there was no Divine Precept for Confeſſion to a Prieſt*; and of the ſame Opinion he grants *Scotus* to have been. But he thinks *it is now declared to be Hereſie, or he wiſhes it were.* And we think it is too much already, unleſs there were better ground for it.

Sess. 14. c. 4.

Lomb. l. 4. Dist. 17. Grat. de Pœnit. Dist. 1. c. 90. Quidam.

Greg. de Valentia. de neceſſit. Confeſſ. c. 2. Maldonat. Oper To. 2. de Pœnit. c. 2, & 3.

2. That an *Anathema* is denounced againſt thoſe who do not underſtand the words of Chriſt, *Whoſe Sins ye remit they are remitted, &c.* of the Sacrament of Penance, ſo as to imply the neceſſity of Confeſſion: Whereas there is no appearance in the words of any ſuch Senſe; and themſelves grant, that in order to the Remiſſion of Sins, by Baptiſm, (of which St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark* ſpeak in the *Apoſtles Commiſſion*) there is no neceſſity of *Sacramental Confeſſion*, but a general Confeſſion is ſufficient. And from hence the Elder *Janſenius* concludes, *That the Power of Remiſſion of Sins here granted, doth not imply* Sacramental Confeſſion. *Cajetant* yields, *There is no Command for Confeſſion here.* And *Catharinus* adds, *That Cajetan would not allow any one Place of Scripture to prove Auricular Confeſſion.* And as to this particular, he denies that there is any Command for it; and he goes not about to prove it, but that *Cajetan* contradicts himſelf elſewhere, *viz.* when he wrote School-Divinity, before he ſet himſelf to the ſtudy of the Scriptures. *Vaſques* ſaith, *That if theſe words may be underſtood of Baptiſm, none can infer from them the Neceſſity of Auricular Confeſſion.* But *Gregory de Valentia* evidently proves, that this place doth relate to Remiſſion of Sins in Baptiſm; not only from the Compariſon of places, but from the Teſtimonies

John 20. 23.

S. Mat. 28. 19. Mark 16. 16.

Janſen. Concor. Evang. c. 147.

Cajetan. in loc. Ed. Paris, 1540.

Catharin. in Cajetan. l. 5. p. 444.

Vaſques. in 3. Part. Th. Tom. 4. Qu. 90. Art. 1. Diſp. 2. Num. 2.

Greg. de Valent. in Thom.

ſtimonies of Saint *Cyprian*, Saint *Ambroſe*, and others.

Tom. 4. Diſp. 7. Qu. 5. Punct. 2. p. 284.

3. That it is expreſſed in the ſame *Anathema*'s that this hath been always the Doctrine and Practice of the Catholick Church from the beginning. We do not deny the ancient practice, either of *Canonical Confeſſion*, as part of the Diſcipline of the Church for publick Offenſes; nor of *Voluntary Confeſſion*, for eaſe and ſatisfaction of the perplexed Minds of doubting or dejected Penitents; but that which we ſay was not owned nor practiſed by the Church from the beginning, was this Sacramental Confeſſion as neceſſary to the Remiſſion of ſins before God. It is therefore to no purpoſe to produce out of *Bellarmine*, and others, a great number of Citations, to prove that which we never deny; but if they hold to the Council of *Trent*, they muſt prove from the Fathers, that Sins after Baptiſm cannot be forgiven without Confeſſion to men: which thoſe who conſider what they do, will never undertake, there being ſo many Teſtimonies of undoubted Antiquity againſt it. And it is obſervable, that *Bonaventure* grants, that before the *Lateran* Decree of *Innocentius* 3. it was no Hereſie to deny the neceſſity of Confeſſion; and ſo he excuſes thoſe who in the time of *Lombard* and *Gratian*, held that Opinion. And all other Chriſtians in the World beſides thoſe of the Church of *Rome*, do to this day reject the neceſsity of particular Confeſſion to a Prieſt, in order to Remiſſion, as the Writers of the Church of *Rome* themſelves confeſs. So *Godignus* doth of the *Abyſſins*; *Philippus à SS. Trinitate*, of the *Jacobites*; *Clemens Galanus* of the *Neſtorians*, who ſaith, *They made a Decree againſt the uſe of Confeſſion to any but to God alone.* And *Alexius Meneſes* of the Chriſtians of St. *Thomas* in the *Indies*. The Greeks believe Confeſſion only to be of Poſitive and Eccleſiaſtical Inſtitution, as the late Author of the *Critical Hiſtory of the Faith and Cuſtoms of the Eaſtern Nations*, proves. And the very Form of their Abſolution declares, that they do not think particular Confeſſion of all known Sins, neceſſary to pardon: for therein the Prieſt abſolves the Penitent from *the ſins he hath not confeſſed through forgetfulneſs, or ſhame.* And now let any one prove this to have been a Catholick Tradition by *Vincentius* his Rules, *viz. That it hath been always received, every where, and by All.*

Bonavent. in l. 4. Sent. Diſt. 17. part 2.
Godign. de rebus Abyſſin. l. 1. c. 28.
Itinerarium Orientale. l. 5. c. 8.
Galan. Concil. Eccl. Armen. Tom. 2. p. 605.
Hiſtoire Critique de la Creance & des Coutums des Nations du Levant. c. 8. p. 105
Ch. 1. pap. 14.
Reſp. 1. Jerem. patriarch. ad Theolog. Wirtemberg. p. 87.
Arcud. de Concord. Eccleſiæ Occident. & Orient. in 7 Sacram. l. 4. c. 3.
Goar in Euchol. p. 681.

VIII. *Of*

VIII. Of Indulgences.

HE *believes, that his Holy Father the* Pope *can give him leave to commit what ſins he pleaſeth; eſpecially, if he can make him a preſent of a round Sum of Mony, he never need doubt of an* Indulgence or Pardon *for himſelf and his Heirs for ever, for all ſorts of Crimes or Wickedneſs, he, or any of his Poſterity may have convenience of falling into. And having this* Commiſſion *in his Pocket, under the* Popes *Broad Seal, he may be confident that Chriſt will confirm, and Church ſtand to all that his* Vicar *upon Earth has granted, and not call him to any account for any thing he has done, although he ſhould chance to die without the leaſt remorſe of Conſcience, or Repentance for his ſins.*

HE believes it damnable to hold, that the *Pope* or any other Power in Heaven or Earth, can give him leave to commit any ſins whatſoever: Or, that for any Sum of Mony he can obtain an *Indulgence or Pardon* for ſins that are to be committed by him, or his Heirs, hereafter. He firmly believes that no ſins can be forgiven, but by a *true and hearty Repentance*: But that ſtill, there is a *Power* in the Church, of granting *Indulgences*, which concern not at all the *Remiſſion of ſins* either Mortal or Venial; but only of ſome Temporal Puniſhments remaining due after the *Guilt* is remitted. So that they are nothing elſe, but a *Mitigation* or *Relaxation* upon juſt cauſes, of *Canonical Penances*, which are or may be injoyn'd by the *Paſtors* of the Church, on penitent ſinners, according to their ſeveral degrees of demerit. And this he is taught to be grounded on the Judiciary Power, left by Chriſt in his *Church*, of *binding and looſing*: whereby Authority was given to erect a *Court of Conſcience*, to aſſign Penalties or releaſe them, as circumſtances ſhould require. And this Authority he knows S. *Paul* plainly own'd, (2 *Cor.* 2. 6.) where he decreed a Penance; *Sufficient* (ſays he) *to ſuch a man, is this puniſhment:* And (2 *Cor.* 2. 10.) where he releaſed one; *For your ſake* (ſpeaking of the Penance injoyn'd the inceſtuous *Corinthian,*) *I forgive it in the Perſon of Chriſt.* And what *Mony* there is given at any time on this account, concerns not at all the *Pope*'s Coffers, but is by every one given as they pleaſe, either to the Poor, to the Sick, to Priſoners, *&c.* wherefore they judge it moſt Charity. And tho' he acknowledges many abuſes have been committed in *granting* and *gaining Indulgences*, through the default of ſome particular Perſons; yet he cannot imagine how theſe can in Juſtice be charg'd upon the *Church*, to the prejudice of her Faith and Doctrine; eſpecially, ſince ſhe has been ſo careful in the retrenching them: As may be ſeen by what what was done in the Council of *Trent. Dec. de Indulg. cum poteſtas.*

VIII. *Of Indulgences.*

1. THey muſt be extreamly ignorant, who take the Power of Indulgences, to be *a Leave from the Pope to commit what Sins they pleaſe; and that by virtue thereof, they ſhall eſcape Puniſhment for their Sins, without Repentance, in another World.* Yet this is the ſenſe of the Miſrepreſentation, which, he ſaith, is made of it. And if he ſaith true in his Preface, *That he hath deſcribed the Belief of a Papiſt, exactly according to the apprehenſion he had when he was a Proteſtant:* He ſhews how well he underſtood the Matters in difference, when I think no other Perſon beſides himſelf ever had ſuch an apprehenſion of it, who pretended to be any thing like a Scholar.

2. *But now he believes it damnable to hold that the Pope, or any other Power in Heaven or Earth, can give him leave to commit any Sins whatſoever; or that for any Sum of Mony, he can obtain any Indulgence or Pardon for Sins that are to be committed by him, or his Heirs hereafter.* Very well! But what thinks he of obtaining an Indulgence, or Pardon, after they are committed? Is no ſuch thing to be obtained in the Court of *Rome* for a Sum of Mony? He cannot but have heard of the *Tax* of the *Apoſtolick Chamber for ſeveral Sins*, and what Sums are there ſet upon them. Why did he not as freely ſpeak againſt this? This is publiſhed in the vaſt *Collection* of *Tracts* of *Canon Law*, ſet forth by the *Popes Authority*, where there are certain Rates for Perjury, Murder, Apoſtacy, &c. Now what do theſe *Sums* of Mony mean? If they be ſmall, it is ſo much the better Bargain, for the Sins are very great. And *Eſpencæus* complains, *that this Book was ſo far from being called in, that*, he ſaith, *the Popes Legats renewed thoſe Faculties, and confirmed them*, It ſeems then a Sum of Mony may be of ſome conſequence towards the obtaining Pardon for a Sin paſt, tho' not for a Licence to commit it. But what mighty difference is there, whether a Man procures with Mony a *Diſpenſation*, or a *Pardon?* For the Sin can hurt him no more, than if he had Licence to commit it.

Tractat. Tractatuum. To. 15. *Part.* 1. *f.* 368.

Eſpencæus in Ep. ad Tit. c. 1. *digreſſ.* 2.

3. *He doth believe there is a Power in the Church to grant Indulgences; which*, he ſaith, *concern not at all the Remiſſion of Sins, either mortal or venial, but only of ſome temporal Puniſhments remaining due after the Guilt is remitted.* Here now ariſes a material Queſtion, *viz.* Whether the *Popes* or the *Repreſenter* be rather to be believed. If the Popes, who grant the Indulgences are to be believed; then not only the bare Remiſſion of Sins is concerned

cerned in them, but *the plenary* and *moſt plenary Remiſſion of Sins* is to be had by them. So *Boniface* the 8*th*, in his Bull of *Jubilee* granted, *Non ſolum plenam & largiorem, imo pleniſſimam veniam peccatorum.* If theſe words had no relation to Remiſſion of Sins, the People were horribly cheated by the ſound of them. In the Bull of *Clement* the 6*th*, not extant in the *Bullarium*, but publiſhed out of the *Utrecht* Manuſcript, not only a plenary Abſolution from all Sins is declared to all perſons who died in the Way to *Rome*; but he commands the Angels of Paradiſe to carry the Soul immediately to Heaven. And I ſuppoſe, whatever implies ſuch an Abſolution as carries a Soul to Heaven, doth concern Remiſſion of Sins. *Boniface* IX. granted Indulgences, *à Pœnâ & à Culpâ*; and thoſe certainly concerned Remiſſion of Sins; being not barely from the temporal Puniſhment, but from the Guilt it ſelf. *Clement* VIII. whom *Bellarmine* magnifies for his care in reforming Indulgences, in his Bull of *Jubilee*, grants *a moſt plenary Remiſſion of Sins*; and *Urban* the 8*th*, ſince him, not only a Relaxation of Penances, but *Remiſſion of Sins*; and ſo lately as *A. D.* 1671. *Clement* the 10*th* publiſhed an Indulgence upon the Canonization of five new Saints, wherein he not only grants a plenary Indulgence of Sins, but upon invocation of one of theſe Saints *in the point of Death, a plenary Indulgence of all his Sins.* And what doth this ſignifie *in the point of Death*, if it do not concern the Remiſſion of Sins?

Bullar. Cherubin. in To. 1. *p.* 204.

Prorſus mandavimus Angelis paradiſi, quantum animam illius à Purgatorio penitus abſolutam in paradiſi gloriam introducant. *Bulla* Clem. 6. *Ultrajecti A.D* 1653.

Gobel. Perſon. Coſmodr. æt. 6. *c.* 86. *p.* 278.

Bullar. *To.*3. *p.* 74. *To.*4. *p.*80.

4. *Indulgences*, he ſaith, *are nothing elſe but a Mitigation or Relaxation, upon juſt Cauſes, of Canonical Penances, which are or may be enjoyned by the Paſtors of the Church on penitent Sinners, according to their ſeveral degrees of Demerits.* If by Canonical Penances, they mean thoſe enjoined by the Penitential Canons, *Greg. de Valentia* ſaith, *This Opinion differs not from that of the Hereticks, and makes Indulgences to be uſeleſs and dangerous things. Bellarmin* brings ſeveral Arguments againſt this Doctrine. (1.) *There would be no need of the Treaſure of the Church; which he had proved to be the Foundation of Indulgences.* (2.) *They would be rather hurtful than profitable, and the Church would deceive her Children by them.* (3.) *They could not be granted for the Dead.* (4.) *They who receive Indulgences, do undergo Canonical Penances.* (5.) *The Form of them doth expreſs, that they do relate to God, & not only to the Church.* And this, I think, is ſufficient to ſhew how far he is from true Repreſenting the Nature of Indulgences; for we do not diſpute the Church's Power in relaxing Canonical Penances to penitent ſinners upon juſt Cauſes.

Greg. de Valent. *de Indulg.* c. 2.

Bell. *de Indulg.* l. 1. *c.* 7. *c.* 2.

IX. Of Satisfaction.

He believes very injuriously of Christs Passion, being perswaded, that his Sufferings & Death were not sufficiently satisfactory for our sins; but that it is necessary for every one to make satisfaction *for themselves. And for this end, after he has been at Confession, the Priest injoyns him a* Penance; *by the performance of which, he is to* satisfie *for his offences; And thus confidently relying upon his own penitential* Works, *he utterly evacuates* Christ's Passion; *and though he professes himself a Christian, and that Christ is his Saviour; yet by his little trusting to him, he seems to think him to be no better, than what his* Crucifix *informs him, that is, a meer* Wooden *one.*

HE believes it damnable, to think injuriously of Christs Passion. Nevertheless he believes, that though *condign Satisfaction* for the Guilt of Sin, and the Pain eternal due to it, be proper only to Christ our Saviour; yet that penitent Sinners being redeem'd by Christ, and made his Members, may in some measure *satisfie* by Prayer, Fasting, Alms, &c. for the *temporal pain*, which by order of God's Justice, sometimes remains due, after the *Guilt*, and the *eternal pains* are remitted. So that trusting in Christ as his Redeemer, he yet does not think that by Christ's Sufferings, every Christian is discharg'd of his particular Sufferings; but that every one is to suffer something for himself, as S. *Paul* did, who by *tribulations*, and in *suffering* in his *own flesh*, did *accomplish those things, that wanted of the Passions of Christ*; and this not only for *himself*, but for the *whole Church*, *Col.* 1. 24. and this he finds every where in *Scripture*, *viz.* People admonish'd of the greatness of their sins, doing Penance in *Fasting*, *Sack-cloth and Ashes*, and by *voluntary* austerities, endeavouring to satisfie the Divine Justice. And these *personal Satisfactions* God has sufficiently also minded him of, in the punishments of *Moses*, *Aaron*, *David*, and infinite others; and even in the Afflictions sent by God upon our own Age, in *Plagues*, *Wars*, *Fires*, *Persecutions*, *Rebellions*, and such like: Which, few are so *Atheistical*, but they confess, to be sent from Heaven for the *just Chastisement* of our sins; and which we are to undergo, notwithstanding the *infinite Satisfaction* made by Christ, and without any undervaluing it. Now being thus convinc'd of some *temporal punishments* being due to his sins, he accepts of all Tribulations, whether in Body, Name or Estate, from whence-soever they come, and, with others of his own chusing, offers them up to God, for the discharging this debt, still confessing, that his Offences deserve yet more. But these penitential Works he is taught to be no otherwise *satisfactory*, than as joyn'd and apply'd to *that satisfaction* which Jesus made upon the Cross; in virtue of which *alone*, all our good Works find a grateful acceptance in God's sight.

IX. *Of Satisfaction.*

1. HE *believes it damnable to think any thing injuriously of Christ's Passion:* But then he distinguishes *the Eternal and Temporal Pain due to Sin. As to the Guilt and Eternal Pain, the satisfaction,* he saith, *is proper to Christ; but as to the Temporal Pain, which may remain due by God's Justice, after the other are remitted,* he saith, *that Penitent Sinners may in some measure satisfy for that by Prayer, Fasting, Alms, &c.*

2. *These Penitential Works,* he saith, *are no otherwise satisfactory, than as joyned and applyed to Christ's Satisfaction, in virtue of which alone our good Works find a grateful acceptance in God's sight.*

But for right apprehending the State of the Controversy, we must consider;

1. That they grant both Eternal and Temporal Pain due to Sin, to be remitted in Baptism; so that all the satisfaction to be made, is for Sins committed after Baptism.

2. We distinguish between Satisfaction to the Church before Absolution, and Satisfaction to the Justice of God for some part of the punishment to sin which is unremitted.

3. We do not deny that truly Penitential Works are pleasing to God, so as to avert his displeasure; but we deny that there can be *any Compensation in way of Equivalency,* between what we suffer, and what we deserve. *Catech. Roman. part. 2. c. 5. n. 52. 56.*

The Matter in Controversy therefore on this Head, consists in these things.

1. That after the total Remission of Sins in Baptism, they suppose a Temporal Punishment to remain, when the Eternal is forgiven; which the Penitent is to satisfy God's Justice for; and without this being done in this Life, he must go into Purgatory for that End. Of which more under that Head.

2. That this Satisfaction may be made to the Justice of God, after Absolution is given by the Priest. So that although the Penitent be admitted into God's Favour, by the Power of the Keys, according to their own Doctrine; yet the Application of the Merits of Christ, together with the Saints in the Sentence of Absolution (according to their Form) do not set him so free, but he either wants a new Supply from the Treasure of the Church, *i. e.* from the same Merits of Christ and the Saints; or else

eiſe he is to ſatisfy for the Temporal Puniſhment by his own Penances.

3. That theſe Penitential Works are to be joyned with the Merits of Chriſt, in the way of proper Satisfaction to Divine Juſtice. And however ſoftly this may be expreſſed, the meaning is, that Chriſt hath merited, that we may merit, and by his Satisfaction, we are enabled to ſatisfy for our ſelves. And if the Satisfaction by way of Juſtice be taken away, the other will be a Controverſy about Words.

Catech. Rom. de panit. Sacr. n. 61.

4. That theſe Penitential Works may not only be ſufficient for themſelves, but they may be ſo over-done, that a great ſhare may be taken from them to make up the Treaſure of the Church, for the benefit of others who fall ſhort, when they are duly applied to them in the way of Indulgences. And about theſe Points, we muſt deſire greater Proof than we have ever yet ſeen.

X. Of Reading the Holy Scripture.

HE *believes it part of his Duty to think meanly of the* Word of God, *to ſpeak irreverently of the* Scripture; *to do what he is able, to leſſen the repute of it, and bring it into diſgrace. And for this end, he ſays it is* obſcure, *full of* ambiguous *expreſſions, plain* contradictions, *not fit to be read by the* Vulgar, *nor fit to be tranſlated into Vulgar Languages: And without reſpect to* Chriſt, *or his* Apoſtles, *profanely Preaches, that no Ten Books in the World have done ſo much miſchief to Chriſtianity as this one: And under a vain pretence of preventing farther inconveniences, endeavours to deprive all of this Spiritual comfort, of this Divine Food, of this Heavenly Light; that ſo being kept in* darkneſs, *they may be alſo preſerv'd in* ignorance, *and Damn'd Eternally.*

HE believes it damnable in any one to think, ſpeak, or do any thing irreverently towards the *Scripture*; or by any means whatſoever to bring it into diſ-repute or diſgrace. He holds it in the higheſt Veneration of all men living, he profeſſes it to be the *Dew of Heaven, Oracles of God, Fountain of Eternal Life*; that to profane it, is to incur the guilt of Damnation: And that we are rather bound to loſe our lives, than concur any way to its profanation. 'Tis true, he does not think it fit, to be read generally by all, without Licence, or in the *Vulgar Tongues:* Not for any diſreſpect to it; But, I. Becauſe he underſtands, that *private Interpretation* is not proper for the *Scripture*, 2 *Pet.* 1. 20. II. Becauſe that in the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*

Paul are *certain things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable deprave, (as also the rest of the Scriptures,) to their own perdition.* III. Because God hath given only *some to be Apostles, some Prophets, other-some Evangelists, and other-some Pastors and Doctors*, Eph. 4. 11. For these Reasons he is taught, That 'tis not convenient for the *Scripture* to be read *indifferently* to all men, but only such as have express Licence, and good testimony from their *Curates*; that they are *humble, discreet*, and *devout* persons; and such as are willing to observe directions in the perusing this *Sacred Volume*: That is, take notice of all Godly Histories, and imitable examples of Humility, Chastity, Obedience, Mercy to the Poor, *&c.* and all such places as are apt to provoke and stir up the hatred of Sin, fear of God's Judgments, love of Virtue, *&c.* and in all *Hard, Obscure* and *Disputable* Points to refer all to the Arbitrement of the *Church*, to the judgment of those whom God hath appointed *Pastors and Doctors*: Never presuming to contend, controul, teach, or talk of their *own Sense* and *Phansie* in deep Questions of Divinity, and *high Mysteries* of Faith; but expecting the sense of *these* from the *Lips of the Priest, who shall keep knowledge, and from whose mouth they shall require the Law*, Mal. 2. 7. And this caution is used, lest that the *Scripture* coming into the hands of a presuming sort of proud, curious and contentious people, be abused and perverted; who make it their business to enquire into Dogmatical, Mystical, High and Hidden secrets of God's Counsels, into *Predestination, Reprobation, Election, Pre-science*, and other such *incomprehensible Mysteries*; and upon the presumption of I know not what *Spirit*, immediately become *Teachers, Controllors*, and *Judges of Doctors, Church, Scripture*, and all; and acknowledging no Authority left by Christ, to which they are to submit; under pretence of *Scripture* and *God's Word*, make way for all sorts of *Profaneness, Irreligion and Atheism*. So that 'tis not for the preserving *Ignorance*, he allows a restraint upon the reading the *Scriptures*, but for the preventing a *blind ignorant Presumption*. And that it may be done to *edification*, and not to *destruction*, and without casting the *holy to dogs, or pearls to swine*.

X. *Of Reading the Holy Scripture.*

1. HE *believes it damnable in any one, to think, speak, or do any thing irreverently towards the Scripture, or by any means whatsoever to bring it into disrepute or disgrace*: but not being contented with this, he adds, *That he holds it in the highest Veneration of all Men living*. Now, here we must desire a little better Representation of this Matter. For certainly, those who derive its Authority from the Church; who set Traditions in

equal

equal eſteem with it; who complain ſo much of its Obſcurity, can never be ſaid to hold in equal Veneration with thoſe who maintain its independent Authority, its Sufficiency and Perſpicuity. And theſe are known and material Points in Controverſy between us and them: therefore let them not ſay, they hold it in the higheſt Veneration of all men living; tho thoſe thought themſelves thorough Catholicks, who have compared it to a *Noſe of Wax*, *to a* Lesbian *Rule*, *to a dead Letter*, *unſenſed Characters*, and to other things, not fit to be repeated. But we are well pleaſed to find them expreſs ſuch Veneration for it. Wherefore then are the people to be kept from reading it?

2. He ſaith, *It is not out of diſreſpect to it.* But why then? (1.) *Becauſe private Interpretation is not proper for the Scripture*, (2 Pet. 1. 20.) One would think the Scripture were not kept *only* from the people, by ſuch a Senſe being put upon it; for any one that would but conſider that place, will find it muſt relate to the Prophets themſelves; and doth he think the Prophets were to be debarred from reading the Scriptures? But this is playing with Scripture, and not reaſoning from it (2) *Becauſe in the Epiſtles of S.* Paul *are certain things hard to be underſtood, which the unlearned and unſtable deprave, as alſo the reſt of the Scriptures, to their own Perdition*, (2 Pet. 3. 16.) Now in my Opinion, ſuch men deſerve more to be debarred from medling with the Scripture, who make ſuch perverſe Inferences from it, than ordinary Readers. And if they uſe all other places, as they do this, they cannot be excuſed from *depraving* it. It is granted, there were then *unlearned and unſtable men*, who miſunderſtood, or miſapplied the Writings of St. *Paul*, and other Scriptures. And what then? There are men of all Ages, who abuſe the beſt things in the World, even the Goſpel it ſelf, and the Grace of God. Doth it hence follow, that the Goſpel muſt not be preached to them, or the grace of God made known to them, for fear of mens making ill uſe of it? If this had been the juſt conſequence, would not St. *Peter* himſelf have thought of this? But he was ſo far from making it, that he adviſeth thoſe perſons he writes to, to have a mighty regard to the Scriptures, even to the Prophetical Writings, *as to a Light ſhining in a dark place*, 1 Pet. 1. 19. According to this way of deducing Conſequences, St. *Peter* ſhould have argued juſt contrary; *The Prophetical Writings are dark and obſcure, therefore meddle not with them, but truſt your Guides*: Whereas the Apoſtle, after he had told

told them what the Apoſtles ſaw and heard, he adds, *That they have a more ſure Prophetical Word*, as the Rhemiſts tranſlate it. How could that be *more ſure* to them, unleſs they were allowed to read, conſider, and make uſe of it? (3.) *Becauſe God hath given only ſome to be Apoſtles, ſome Prophets, other ſome Evangeliſts, and other ſome Paſtors and Doctors*, Epheſ. 4. 11. Doth it hence follow that the People are not to read the Scriptures? In the Univerſities, Tutors are appointed to interpret *Ariſtotle* to their Pupils; doth it hence follow that they are not to read *Ariſtotle* themſelves? It is, no doubt, a mighty Advantage to have ſuch infallible Interpreters as the *Apoſtles and Prophets*; and all Chriſtians are bound to follow their Senſe, where they have delivered it. But ſuppoſe the Queſtion be about the Senſe of theſe Interpreters; muſt their Books not be looked into, becauſe of the danger of Error? This Reaſon will ſtill hold againſt thoſe who go about to deliver their Senſe; and ſo on, till by this Method of Reaſoning, all ſort of Books and Interpretations be rejected; unleſs any ſuch can be found out, which is not liable to be abuſed or miſunderſtood. And if there be any ſuch to be had, they are much to blame who do not diſcover it. But as yet we ſee no Remedy for two things in Mankind, a proneneſs to Sin, and to Miſtake. But of all things, we ought not to take away from them one of the beſt Means to prevent both, *viz.* a diligent, and careful, and humble reading the Holy Scriptures.

But, 3. He denies *that all perſons are forbid to read the Scriptures, but only ſuch as have Licenſe, and good Teſtimony from their Curats: and therefore their deſign is not to preſerve Ignorance in the people, but to prevent a blind, ignorant preſumption.*

Theſe are plauſible pretences to ſuch as ſearch no farther; but the Myſtery of this matter lies much deeper. It was, no doubt, the Deſign of the Church of *Rome* to keep the Bible wholly out of the hands of the people. But upon the Reformation they found it impoſſible; ſo many Tranſlations being made into vulgar Languages; and therefore care was taken to have Tranſlations made by ſome of their own Body; and ſince the people of better inclinations to Piety were not to be ſatisfied without the Bible; therefore they thought it the better way to permit certain perſons whom they could truſt, to have a Licenſe to read it: And this was the true Reaſon of the fourth Rule of the *Index Liber. prohibit.* made in purſuiance of the Order of the Council of *Trent*, and publiſhed by *Pius* IV. by which any one may

ſee it was not an Original Permiſſion out of any good Will to the Thing; but an Aftergame to get the Bible out of the hands of the People again: And therefore Abſolution was to be denied to thoſe who would not deliver them to their Ordinaries when they were called for: And the Regulars themſelves were not to be permitted to have Bibles without a Licenſe: And as far as I can underſtand the Addition of *Clement* VIII. to that fourth Rule, he withdraws any new Power of granting ſuch Licenſes; and ſaith they are contrary to the *Command and Uſage of that Church, which*, he ſaith, *is to be inviolably obſerved:* Wherein I think he declares himſelf fully againſt ſuch Licenſes: And that inferior Guides ſhould grant them againſt the Command of the Head of the Church, is a thing not very agreeable to the Unity and Subordination they boaſt of.

Quod quidem inviolate ſervandum eſt. Clem. VIII. *ad Reg. 4 Indicis Romæ.*

XI. Of Apocryphal Books.

HE believes it *lawful to make what* Additions *to Scripture his Party thinks good*; *and therefore takes no notice of the ancient* Canon *approved by the Apoſtles and primitive Chriſtians*; *but allows* equal *Authority to the Books of* Toby, Judith, Eccleſiaſticus, Wiſdom, *and the* Macchabees, *as to the other part of the* Scripture; *altho' theſe were always rejected by the* Jews, *never exant in the* Hebrew *Copy, and expreſly condemn'd by St.* Jerome, *as* not Canonical, *and never admitted by the* Church, *but only of late years, in ſome of their Synods, which made theſe* Innovations *contrary to the Senſe of their Anceſtors.*

HE believes it damnable to *add* any thing to the Scripture. And yet allows the Books of *Toby, Judith, Eccleſiaſticus, Wiſdom, Macchabees*, to be *Canonical*: becauſe the *Church* of Chriſt has declar'd them *ſuch*; not only in theſe later ages, but even in the primitive times. S. *Gregory Nazianzen*, (*Orat. de SS. Macc.*) who lived in the year 354. Alſo S. *Ambroſe*, (*lib. de Jacob. & vit. beat.*) An. 370. *Innocent.* I. (*Ep. ad Exup.*) They were alſo received by the third Council of *Carthage*, *An.* 419. which approv'd all theſe Books as *Canonical*, Can. 47. and was ſubſcrib'd by S. *Auguſtine*, and confirm'd in the *6th* General Synod, *Auguſt. lib.* 2. *Doct. Chriſt. cap.* 8. So that to him 'tis of little concern, whether they were ever in the *Hebrew Copy*; the Canon of the *Church* of Chriſt being of much more Authority with him, than the Canon of the *Jews*: He having no other aſſurance that the Books of *Moſes*, and the four Goſpels, are the true *Word* of God, but by the *Authority* and *Canon* of the *Church*. And this he has learn'd from that great Doctor S. *Auguſtine*, who

who declares his mind plainly in this case, saying, *That he would not believe the Gospel, except the Authority of the Catholick Church mov'd him thereunto.* (*Contra Ep. Fundam.* c. 4.) Now he is well satisfied, that many doubted whether these Books were *Canonical* or no; and amongst others, S. *Jerom*; because the Church had not declar'd them so: But since the *Church*'s Declaration, no Catholick ever doubted; no more than of other Books, *viz.* of the *Epistle to the* Hebrews, the *Epistle of St.* James, the *second of St.* Peter, the *second and third of St.* John, *St.* Jude's *Epistle*, *and the* Apocalyps: All which were for many years after the Apostles time doubted of; but afterwards declar'd and receiv'd as *Canonical*. This he finds S. *Jerome* expresly confessing of himself, *viz. That for some time the Book of* Judith *seemed to him Apocryphal*; to wit, till the Council of *Nice* declar'd it otherwise. *Praf. in Judith.* The like he affirms of S. *James's Epistle*, that it was doubted of by many for several years; *Paulatim tempore procedente meruit authoritatem: By little and little in process of time it gain'd Authority. De viris illus. verb. Jacob.* For this reason he matters not what Books have been reputed *Apocryphal* by some, and for some years: But only what Books are *receiv'd* and *declar'd* by the *Church*, *Canonical*, in what year, and at what time soever. For believing the *same Spirit of Truth* assists her in *all Ages*; he looks upon himself equally oblig'd to receive her *Definitions* of the Year 419. as of any of the precedent years: It not being possible for Christ to fail of his *Promise*, or the Holy Ghost to *err* or *misguide* the *Church* in *that* year, more than in *any other.*

XI. *Of Apocryphal Books.*

1. WE do not charge the Church of *Rome* with *making what Additions to Scripture they think good*, as the *Misrepresenter* saith; but we charge them with taking into the Canon of Scripture such Books as were not received for Canonical by the Christian Church; as those Books himself mentions, *viz. Toby*, *Judith*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Wisdom*, and *Maccabees.*

2. We do not only charge them with this, but with Anathematizing all those who do not upon this Declaration believe them to be Canonical; since they cannot but know, that these Books never were in the *Jewish* Canon, and were left out by many Christian Writers. And if the Church cannot add to the Scripture, and our Author *thinks it damnable to do it*; how can it make any Books *Canonical*, which were not so received by the Church? For the *Scripture* in this sense is the *Church*'s; and therefore if it add to the *Canon*, it adds to the Scripture; *i. e.* it

Consil. Trident. Sess. 4. 8. *Ap. de Canon Script.*

makes it necessary to believe some Books to be of infallible Authority, which were not believed to be so, either by the *Jewish* or Christian Church, as appears by abundant Testimonies to that purpose produced by a learned Bishop of this Church; which ought to have been considered by the *Representer*, that he might not have talked so crudely about this matter.

Bp *Cosins* Scholastical History of the Canon of Scripture.

But however, I must consider what he saith;

Greg. Nazianzen. *in carmin.* 2 *Vol. p.* 98.

1. He produces the Testimony of *Greg. Nazianzen*, who is expressly against him, and declares but Twenty two Books in the Canon of the Old Testament; but how doth he prove that he thought these Books Canonical? He quotes his *Oration on the Maccabees*; Where I can find nothing like it; and instead of it he expressly follows, as he declares, the Book of *Josephus*, of *the Authority of Reason* concerning them. So that if this proves any thing, it proves *Josephus* his Book Canonical, and not the *Maccabees*.

Orat. de Maccab. vol. 1. *p.* 398.

Ambros. de Jacob. & Vitæ Erat. l. 2. *c.* 10, 11, 12.

2. He adds the Testimony of S. *Ambrose*, who in the place he refers to, enlarges on the Story of the *Maccabees*, but saith nothing of the Authority of the Book. And even *Coccius* himself grants that of old *Melito Sardensis*, *Amphilochius*, *Greg. Nazianzen*, the Council of *Laodicea*, S. *Hierom*, *Russinus*, and *Gregory* the Great, did not own the Book of *Maccabees* for Canonical.

Coc. i. Thes. Cathol. l. 6. *Art.* 18

Scholastical history, c. 83.

3. *Innocentius ad Exuperium* speaks more to this purpose. And if the Decretal Epistle be allowed, against which Bishop *Cosins* hath made considerable Objections; then it must be granted, that these Books were then in the *Roman* Canon; but that they were not received by the Universal Church, appears evidently by the Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, *c.* 60. wherein these Books are left out; and this was received in the Code of the Universal Church; which was as clear a Proof of the Canon then generally received, as can be expected. It is true, the Council of *Carthage* took them in; and S. *Augustine* seems to be of the same Opinion: But on the other side, they are left out by *Melito* Bishop of *Sardis*, who lived near the Apostles times, *Origen*, *Athanasius*, S. *Hilary*, S. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, *Epiphanius*, S. *Basil*, *Amphilochius*, S. *Chrysostom*, and especially S. *Jerom*, who hath laboured in this point so much, that no fewer than thirteen places are produced out of him to this purpose, by the forementioned learned Bishop of our Church, who clearly proves there was no Tradition for the Canon of the Council of *Trent* in any one Age of the Christian Church. But our Author goes on.

Euseb. l. 6. *c.* 24
Orig. Pref. in Psal.
Athan. in Synopsi.
Hilar pref. in Psal.
S. Cyril. Catech. 4.
Epiphan. Her. 8. 76
Basil. philocal. c. 3.
Amphil. Epist. Canon. ad Seleuc.
Chrys. hom. 4. *in Gen.*
Scholast. List. n. 71.

4. *It*

4. *It is of little concern to him, whether these Books were ever in the Hebrew Copy.* I would only ask whether it be of any concern to him, whether they were divinely inſpired or not? He ſaith, *It is damnable to add to the Scripture*; by the Scripture we mean Books written by Divine Inſpiration: Can the Church make Books to be ſo written, which were not ſo written? If not, then all it hath to do, is to deliver by Tradition what was ſo, and what not. Whence ſhould they have this Tradition, but from the *Jews*? and they owned no Divine Inſpiration after the time of *Malachy*. How then ſhould there be any Books ſo written after that time? And he that ſaith in this matter, as he doth, *It is of little concern to him whether they were in the Hebrew Canon*, doth little concern himſelf what he ought to believe, and what not, in this matter.

5. *Since the Churches Declaration*, he ſaith, *no Catholicks ever doubted.* What doth he mean by the Churches Declaration, that of *Innocent*, and the Council of *Carthage*? Then the ſame Biſhop hath ſhewed him, that ſince that time, there have been very many, both in the *Greek* and *Latin* Church, of another Opinion. And a little before the Council of *Trent*, *Catharinus* ſaith, *That a Friend of his, and a Brother in Chriſt, derided him as one that wanted Learning, for daring to aſſert theſe Books were within the Canon of Scripture*; and it is plain, *Card. Cajetan* could never be perſwaded of it: But if he means ſince the Council of *Trent*, then we are returned to our Difficulty, how ſuch a Council can make any Books Canonical, which were not received for ſuch by the Catholick Church before? For then they do not declare the Canon, but create it.

Cathar. Adver. Cajet. p. 48. ed. Paris 1535.

XII. Of the Vulgar Edition of the Bible.

HE *makes no Conſcience of* abuſing *the* Scripture, *and perverting, for the maintenance of his Errors and Superſtitions. And therefore, though he dares not altogether lay it by; leſt he ſhould, by ſo doing, loſe all claim to Chriſtianity: Yet he utterly diſapproves it, as it is in its genuine Truth and Purity, and as allow'd in the Church of*

HE believes it a damnable ſin, to *abuſe the Scripture*, or any ways to pervert it, for the maintenance of Errors or Superſtitions, and thinks himſelf oblig'd, rather to lay down his life, than concur to, or approve of any ſuch Falſifications or Corruptions, prejudicial to *Faith* or *Good Manners*. For this reaſon, being conſcious,

England; *and crying this down, he believes it unlawful to be read by any of his Communion. And then puts into their hands another Volume, which in its Frontiſ-piece bears the Title indeed of the* Word of God, *with the names of the* Books *and* Chapters; *but in the context of it, is ſo every where full of Corruptions, Falſifications, and intolerable Abuſes, that it almoſt every where belies its* Title, *and is unfit for any one, who profeſſes himſelf a Chriſtian.*

ſcious, that in all Ages, there has been ſeveral *Copies* of this Sacred Volume, quite different from the *Originals* in many places, either through the *miſtake* of the *Tranſcribers*, or *malice* of others, endeavouring by this means to gain credit to their new Doctrines: He is commanded not to receive all Books indifferently for the *Word of God*, that wear that *Title*; but only ſuch as are approv'd by the *Church*, and recommended by her *Legitimate*. And ſuch is that, he daily uſes, commonly known by the name of the *Vulgar Tranſlation*; which has been the principal of all other *Latin Copies* in all Ages, ſince the Primitive times; much commended by St. *Auguſtine*; and never altered in any thing, but once heretofore by the Holy Studies of St. *Hierome*: And twice or thrice ſince, being review'd by Authority, and purg'd of ſuch miſtakes, as in length of time, had crept in by Tranſcribers, or *Printers* faults. And that *this Tranſlation* is moſt pure and incorrupt, as to any thing concerning matter of *Belief*, or differences in *Religion*, is not only the Doctrine of *his Church*; but alſo the Sentiment of many Learned Men of the *Reformation*, who approve *this Verſion*, and prefer it before any other *Latin* one whatſoever. *Beza* in his Preface to the *New-Teſtament*, Anno 1559. blames *Eraſmus* for rejecting it. *Paulus Fagius* cries out againſt all that diſallow it, (*Cap.* 4. *Verſ. Lat. Paraph Chald.*) *Ludovicus de Dieu*, with admiration confeſſes it to be moſt *Faithful*, (*in Not. ad Evang. Praf.*) *Cauſabon* prefers it before the *Greeks Text* now in uſe; and acknowledges that it agrees with the *Ancient Manuſcripts*, (*in Not. ad Evang. & Act.*) *Grotius* profeſſes to the World, that he highly eſteems it, for that it contains no erroneous Opinions, and is very Learned; (*nulla dogmata inſalubria continet, & multum habet in ſe eruditionis, Præf. Annot. in vet. Teſt.*) And for this reaſon, he refers his *Annotations* generally to this *Tranſlation*, as he declares himſelf. So that, ſeeing *this Verſion* is deliver'd to him with the approbation of his *whole Church*, and is commended by moſt Learned Adverſaries; he thinks he has great reaſon to receive it, and that he may peruſe it, without any danger that can come to him, from any *Corruptions* or *Falſifications*. And becauſe he has not the like aſſurance of the *Engliſh Tranſlation* allowed by *Proteſtants*, or any other made ſince the *Reformation*, by any of that Perſwaſion; but ſees, that there has been almoſt as many different *Tranſlations* made and publiſhed by theſe, as there had been men of different Humours, different Spirits,

Spirits, and different Intereſts; whereof none have ever approv'd the *Verſions* of any of the reſt; but cry'd out againſt, and Condemn'd them, of many *Alterations*, *Additions*, *Detractions*, and *Forgeries*; *Bucer*, and the *Oſiandrians* exclaiming againſt *Luther*, *Luther* againſt *Munſter*; *Beza* againſt *Caſtaleo*; *Caſtaleo* againſt *Beza*; *Calvin* againſt *Servetus*; *Illyricus* againſt *Calvin* and *Beza*. Our *Engliſh Miniſters* againſt *Tindal* and his Fellows: And this, not upon the account of ſome overſights, or like miſtakes, or the following of different Copies; but accuſing one another of being *Abſurd* and *ſenſeleſs*, in their *Traſlations* of *obſcuring* and *perverting* the meaning of the *Holy Ghoſt*, of *Omiſſions* and *Additions*, of *perverting* the Text in eight hundred forty and eight pieces; of *corrupt* and *falſe Tranſlations*; all which in expreſs Terms, has been charg'd by great Abbetters of the *Reformation* againſt a *Bible* yet us'd in *England*, and ordered to be read in all Churches by Queen *Elizabeth*, and to be ſeen in the Abridgement of a Book deliver'd by certain *Miniſters* to King *James*, pag. 11. 12. in Mr. *Burges*'s *Apology*, Sect. 6. Mr. *Broughton*'s *Advertiſement* to the Biſhops. And in Doctor *Reynold*'s refuſing before the King at *Hampton-Court*, to ſubſcribe to the *Communion-Book*, becauſe it warranted a *corrupt* and *falſe Tranſlation of the Bible*. For theſe and ſuch other reaſons, he is commanded not to read any of theſe *Tranſlations*; but only that, which is recommended to him by the *Church*.

XII. *Of the Vulgar Edition of the Bible.*

1. WE do not diſpute about the *Vulgar Edition*, whether it may not be preferr'd before modern *Latin* Editions, becauſe of its great *Antiquity* in ſome parts of it, and its general Reception ſince the time of *Gregory* I. But our diſpute is, whether it be made ſo *Authentick* ſince the Council of *Trent*, that no Appeals are to be made to the Originals, *i. e.* whether that Council by its Authority could make a Verſion equal to the Originals out of which it was made? Eſpecially ſince at the time of that Decree, the Vulgar Edition was confeſſed to be full of Errors and Corruptions by *Sixtus* V. who ſaith, he took infinite pains to correct them, and yet left very many behind, as appeared by *Clement* VIII. who corrected his *Bibles* in very many places, and grants ſome faults were left uncorrected ſtill: Now, how was it poſſible for the Council of *Trent* to declare that Edition Authentick, which was afterwards ſo much corrected? And, whether was the correct Edition of *Sixtus* V. *Authentick* or not, being made in purſuance of the Decree of the Council? If not, how comes *Clement* his Edition to be made Authen-

In hac Vulgata Editione viſa ſunt nonnulla mutanda, quæ conſulto mutata non ſunt. Clem. VIII. *in Bulla.*

Luc. Brugenſ. *in variis Lect.*

Authentick, when the other was not, ſince there may be Corruptions found in that, as well as the other; and no one can tell, but it may be reviewed and corrected ſtill; as ſome of their own Writers confeſs *it ſtands in need of it*?

Nat. Alexan. *diſſert. de vulg. verſ. quæſt. 6.*

2. Our Controverſy is not ſo much about the Authority of the Vulgar *Latin*, above other *Latin* Verſions to thoſe who underſtand them; but whether none elſe but the *Latin* Verſion muſt be uſed by thoſe who underſtand it not? And here our *Repreſenter* ſaith, *That he is commanded not to read any of theſe Tranſlations* (ſpeaking of *Tindal's, and that in Queen* Elizabeths *time) but only that which is recommended to him by the Church.* If this relate to the *Vulgar Latin*, then we are to ſeek, why the common people ſhould have none to read, but what they cannot underſtand; if to *Tranſlations of their own*, then we doubt not to make it appear, that our Tranſlation allowed among us, is more exact and agreeable than any they can put into their hands.

XIII. Of the Scripture as a Rule of Faith.

HE *believes it lawful*; *nay, that it is his obligation to undervalue the* Scripture, *and take from it that* Authority, *which Chriſt gave it. For whereas Chriſt left this to the World, as the* Rule of Faith, *and as a* Sacred Oracle, *from whence all his Followers might be inſtructed in the Precepts of a good Life, learn all the* Myſteries *of their* Faith, *and be reſolv'd in all difficult and doubtful Points of* Religion: *He is taught flatly to deny all this*; *and to believe that the* Scripture *is not capable of deciding any one point of* Controverſy, *or reconciling the different Sentiments of Men in* Religion: *And thus demeans himſelf towards the* word of God, *in a manner moſt unbecoming a Chriſtian.*

HE believes it damnable to undervalue the *Scripture*, or take from it the *Authority* given it by Chriſt. He gives it all reſpect due to the *Word of God*; he owns it to be of greateſt *Authority* upon Earth, and that it is capable of leading a Man to all *Truth*, whenſoever it is rightly underſtood. But to any one that *miſunderſtands* it, and takes it in any other ſenſe, than what was intended by the *Holy Ghoſt*; he believes it to ſuch a one, to be *no Scripture, no word of God*; that to ſuch a one, it is *no Rule of Faith*, nor *Judge of Controverſies.* And that what he thinks to be the *Doctrine* of Chriſt, and *Command* of Heaven, is nothing but his *own Imagination*, and the *ſuggeſtion* of the Devil. And ſince, by the

the experience of ſo many thouſand *Hereſies* ſince our Saviour's time, all pretending to be grounded on *Scripture*, he finds that almoſt every *Text* of the *Bible*, and even thoſe that concern the moſt *Eſſential* and *Fundamental* Points of the *Chriſtian Religion*, may be interpreted ſeveral ways; and made to ſignifie things *contrary* to one another; and that while thus *contrary* meanings are by ſeveral Perſons drawn from the *ſame Words*; the *Scripture* is altogether *ſilent*, without diſcovering, *which* of all thoſe Senſes is *that* intended by the *Holy Ghoſt*, and leading to Truth, and which are Erroneous and Antichriſtian: He is taught to believe that the *Scripture alone* can be no *Rule* of *Faith* to any *private* or *particular* perſon; not that there is any thing wanting on the *Scripture-ſide*; but becauſe no *private* perſon can be certain, whether amongſt all the *ſeveral* meanings *every Text* is obnoxious to, that which he underſtands it in, is the *Right*, *or no*. And without this *certainty of Truth*, and *ſecurity from Error*, he knows, there's nothing capable of being a *Rule*.

XIII. *Of the Scriptures as a Rule of Faith.*

THE only thing inſiſted on here is, *That it is not the Words, but the Senſe of Scripture is the Rule; and that this Senſe is not to be taken from Mens private Fancies, which are various and uncertain; and therefore where there is no ſecurity from Errors, there is nothing capable of being a Rule.*

To clear this, we muſt conſider,

1. That it is not neceſſary to the making of a Rule, to prevent any poſſibility of miſtake, but that it be ſuch that they cannot miſtake without their own fault. For Certainty in it ſelf, and Sufficiency for the uſe of others, are all the neceſſary Properties of a Rule; but after all, it's poſſible for Men not to apply the Rule aright, and then they are to be blamed, and not the Rule.

2. If no Men can be certain of the right Senſe of Scripture, then it is not plain in neceſſary things; which is contrary to the deſign of it, and to the cleareſt Teſtimonies of Antiquity, and to the common Senſe of all Chriſtians, who never doubted or diſputed the Senſe of ſome things revealed therein; as the Unity of the Godhead, the making of the World by him, the Deluge, the Hiſtory of the Patriarchs, the Captivity of the Jews, the coming of the Meſſias, his ſending his Apoſtles, his coming again to Judgment, *&c.* No Man who reads ſuch things in Scripture, can have any doubt about the Senſe and Meaning of the Words.

3. Where the Senſe is **dubious, we do not allow any Man** to put what Senſe he pleaſes upon them; **but we ſay,** there are certain means, whereby he may either attain to the true Senſe, or not be damned if he do not. And the firſt thing every man is to regard, is not his ſecurity from being deceived, but from being damned. For Truth is made known in order to Salvation: If therefore I am ſure to attain the chief end, I am not ſo much concerned, as to the poſſibility of Errors, as that I be not deceived by my own fault. We do not therefore leave Men *either to follow their own fancy, or to interpret Scripture by it*; but we ſay, They are bound upon pain of Damnation to ſeek the Truth ſincerely, and to uſe the beſt means in order to it; and if they do this, they either will not err, or their Errors will not be their Crime.

XIV. Of the Interpretation of Scripture.

HE *believes that* his Church, *which he calls* Catholick, *is above the* Scripture; *and profanely, allows to her an uncontrollable* Authority *of being* Judge *of the* Word of God. *And being fondly abus'd, into a diſtruſt of the* Scriptures; *and that he can be certain of nothing, even of the* Fundamentals *of Chriſtianity, from what is deliver'd in them, though they ſpeak never ſo plainly; he is taught to rely wholly upon* this Church, *and not to believe one word the* Scripture *ſays, unleſs his* Church *ſays it too.*

HE believes, that the *Church* is not above the *Scripture*; but only allows *that Order* between them, as is between the *Judge* and the *Law*. And is no other than what generally every *private Member* of the *Reformation* challenges to himſelf, as often as he pretends to *decide* any *doubt* of his own, or his Neighbours in Religion, by *interpreting the Scripture*. Neither is he taught at all to diſtruſt the *Scripture*, or not to rely on it; but only to diſtruſt his *own private Interpretation* of it, and not to rely on his *own Judgment*, in the *Reſolution* of any *doubt* concerning *Faith* or *Religion*, though he can produce ſeveral *Texts* in favour of his *Opinion*. But all ſuch caſes he is commanded to re-cur to the *Church*; and having learnt from her the ſenſe of all ſuch Texts; how they have been underſtood by the whole Community of Chriſtians, in all Ages ſince the Apoſtles; and what has been their *Receiv'd Doctrine*, in ſuch doubtful and difficult Points; he is oblig'd to ſubmit to this, and never preſume on his own *private Sentiments*, however ſeemingly grounded on *Reaſon* and *Scripture*, to believe or preach any

New

New Doctrine opposite to the *Belief of the Church*; But as he receives from her the *Book*, ſo alſo to receive from her the *Senſe of the Book*: With a Holy Confidence, that ſhe that did not cheat him in delivering a *Falſe Book* for the *True one*, will not cheat him in delivering a *Falſe* and *Erroneus Senſe* for the *True one*; her *Authority*, which is *ſufficient* in the *one*, being *not leſs* in the *other*: And his own *private Judgment*, which was *inſufficient* in the *one*, that is, in finding out the *True Scripture*, and diſcerning it from all other Books; being as incapable and inſucffiient in the *other*; that is, in certainly diſcovering the meaning of the Holy Ghoſt, and avoiding all other *Heterodox* and *miſtaken Interpretations*.

XIV. *Of the Interpretation of Scripture.*

1. THE Queſtion is not, Whether Men are not bound to make uſe of the beſt means for the right Interpretation of Scripture, by Reading, Meditation, Prayer, Advice, a humble and teachable Temper, *&c. i. e.* all the proper means fit for ſuch an end? but whether after all theſe, there be a neceſſity of ſubmitting to ſome infallible Judge, in order to the attaining the certain Senſe of Scripture?

2. The Queſtion is not, Whether we ought not to have a mighty regard to the Senſe of the whole Chriſtian Church in all Ages ſince the Apoſtles, which we profeſs to have; but, Whether the *preſent Roman Church*, as it ſtands divided from other Communions, hath ſuch a Right and Authority to interpret Scripture, that we are bound to believe that to be the infallible Senſe of Scripture which ſhe delivers?

And here I cannot but take notice how ſtrangely this matter is here miſrepreſented: for the Caſe is put,

1. *As if every one who rejects their pretence of Infallibility, had nothing to guide him but his own private Fancy in the Interpretation of Scripture.*

2. *As if we rejected the Senſe put upon Scripture by the whole Community of Chriſtians in all ages ſince the Apoſtles times.* Whereas we appeal, in the matters in difference between us, to this univerſal Senſe of the Chriſtian Church, and are verily perſwaded they cannot make it out in any one Point wherein we differ from them. And themſelves cannot deny, that in ſeveral we have plainly the Conſent of the firſt Ages, as far as appears by the Books remaining, on our ſide; as in the Worſhip of Images, Invocation of Saints, Papal Supremacy, Communion

in both kinds, Prayer and Scripture in known Tongues; and I may ſafely add, the Sufficiency of the Scripture, Tranſubſtantiation, Auricular Confeſſion, Publick Communions, Solitary Maſſes, to name no more.

But here lies the Artifice; We muſt not pretend to be capable of judging either of Scripture, or Tradition; but we muſt truſt their Judgment what is the Senſe of Scripture, and what hath been the Practice of the Church in all Ages, although their own Writers confeſs the contrary: which is very hard.

But he ſeems to argue for ſuch a Submiſſion to the Church;

1. *Becauſe we receive the Book of Scripture from her; therefore from her we are to receive the Senſe of the Book.* An admirable Argument! We receive the *Old Teſtament* from the *Jews*; therefore from them we are to receive the Senſe of the *Old Teſtament*, and ſo we are to reject the true *Meſſias*. But this is not all: If by the Church, they mean the Church of *Rome* in diſtinction from others, we deny it: if they mean the whole Chriſtian Church, we grant it: but then the force of it is quite loſt. But why is it not poſſible for the Church of *Rome* to keep theſe Writings, and deliver them to others, which make againſt her ſelf? Do not Perſons in Law-Suits often produce Deeds which make againſt them? But there is yet a further Reaſon; it was not poſſible for the Church of *Rome* to make away theſe *Writings*, being ſo univerſally ſpread.

2. *Becauſe the Church puts the difference between true and falſe Books, therefore that muſt be truſted for the true Senſe of them.* Which is juſt as one ſhould argue, The Clerks of the Rolls are to give an account to the Court of true Records, therefore they are to ſit on the Bench, and to give Judgment in all Cauſes. The Church is only to declare what it finds as to Canonical Books; but hath no Power to make any Book Canonical, which was not before received for ſuch. But I confeſs *Stapleton* ſaith, the Church if it pleaſe may make *Hermes* his Paſtor and *Clemens* his Conſtitutions Canonical: but I do not think our Author will therein follow him.

Controv. 5. Qu. 4. art. 2.

XV. Of

XV. of Tradition.

HE *believes the* Scripture *to be* imperfect: *And for the ſupplying of what he thinks* Defective *in it, he admits Humane* Ordinations *and* Traditions *of Men*; *allowing* equal *Authority to* theſe, *as to the* Scriptures themſelves; *thinking himſelf as much oblidg'd to ſubmit to theſe, and believe them with Divine Faith, as he does, whatſoever is written in the* Bible, *and confeſſedly ſpoken by the Author of all Truth, God himſelf. Neither will he admit of any one to be a Member of his Communion, although he undoubtedly believes every Word that's written in the* Scripture; *unleſs he alſo aſſents to theſe* Traditions, *and gives as great credit to them, as to the* Word of God, *although in that there is not the leaſt footſtep of them to be found.*

HE believes the *Scripture* not to be *imperfect*, nor to want Humane *Ordinations*, or *Traditions* of Men, for the ſupplying any defects in it: Neither does he allow the *ſame* Authority to *theſe*, as to the *Word of God*; or give them equal credit; or exact it of others, that deſire to be admitted into the communion of his Church. He believes no *Divine Faith* ought to be given to any thing, but what is of *Divine Revelation*; and that nothing is to have place in his *Creed*, but what was taught by Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, and has been believ'd and taught in all Ages by the *Church* of God, the Congregation of all True Believers, and has been ſo deliver'd down to him through all Ages. But now, whether that which has been ſo deliver'd down to him, as the Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, has been by *Word of Mouth* or *Writing*, is altogether indifferent to him; he being ready to follow, in this point, as in all others, the command of St. *Paul*, that is, To *ſtand faſt, and hold the Traditions he has learn'd, whether by Word, or by Epiſtle*, 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 15. And to look upon any one as *Anathema, That ſhall preach otherwiſe than he has* (thus) *receiv'd* Gal. 1. 9. So that as he undoubtedly holds the *Scripture* to be the *Word of God*, penn'd by Prophets and Apoſtles, and inſpir'd by the Holy Ghoſt, becauſe in all Ages, from *Moſes* to Chriſt, and from Chriſt to this time, it has been ſo Taught, Preach'd, Believ'd and Deliver'd ſucceſſively by the Faithful; and never ſcruples the leaſt of the truth of it; nor ſticks to aſſent to it, with a ſtedfaſt and *Divine Faith*; altho' they are not, nor have not at any time been able to prove what they have thus taught, and deliver'd with one *Text of Scripture*. In the like manner, he is ready to receive and believe, all that this *ſame Congregation* has, together with the *Bible*, in all Ages ſucceſſively, without interruption, Taught, Preach'd, Believ'd and Deliver'd *as the Doctrine of Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*; and aſſent to it with *Divine Faith*;

juſt

juſt as he does to the *Bible*; and eſteems any one *Anathema*, that ſhall Preach otherwiſe than he has thus receiv'd. And although ſome may ſeriouſly endeavour to convince him, that ſeveral Points of Faith, and other Religious Practices, which he has thus receiv'd and believes, are not the Doctrine of Chriſt, nor Apoſtolical Inſtitutions, but rather Inventions of Men, and Leſſons of Antichriſt, and ſhould produce ſeveral Texts of Scripture for the proving it: He is not any thing ſurpriz'd at it: As well knowing, that he that follows not this Rule, of *Believing all to be of Chriſt, that has been univerſally taught and believ'd as ſuch, by the Church of Chriſt; and of underſtanding the Scripture in the ſame ſenſe, in which it has in all Ages been underſtood by the ſame Church*; may very eaſily frame as many *Creeds* as he pleaſes, and make Chriſt and his Apoſtles ſpeak what ſhall be moſt agreeable to his *Humour*, and ſuit beſt with his *Intereſt*, and find plain proofs for all: And make no more difficulty in producing *Scripture* againſt Chriſt's *Doctrine*. than the *Jews* and the *Devil* did againſt Chriſt's *Perſon*, who never wanted their *Scriptum eſt*; (*It is written*;) when 'twas neceſſary to carry on their deſigns. And if there were any thing in theſe ſort of Arguments, to make him doubt of the truth of any *Point* of Doctrine, thus receiv'd; he thinks it might make him call in queſtion the Truth of the *Scripture*, and the *Bible* it ſelf, as ſoon as any thing elſe. They all ſtanding upon the ſame foundation of the Church's Tradition, which, if it fail in one, leaves no ſecurity in any.

XV. *Of Tradition.*

1. THE Queſtion is not about *Human Traditions ſupplying the Defects of Scripture*, as he miſrepreſents it; but whether there be an Unwritten word, which we are equally bound to receive with the Written word: Altho theſe things which paſs under that Name, are really but *Humane Traditions*; yet we do not deny that they pretend them to be of Divine Original.

2. We do not deny, but the *Apoſtles might deliver ſuch things by Word, as well as by Epiſtle, which their Diſciples were bound to believe and keep*: but we think there is ſome difference to be made between what we certainly know they delivered in Writing, and what it is now impoſſible for us to know; *viz.* what they delivered by word without writing.

2. Theſ. 2. 13.

3. We ſee no ground why any one ſhould believe any Doctrine *with a ſtedfaſt and divine Faith*, which is not bottom'd on the Written word; for then his Faith muſt be built on the Teſtimony

mony of the Church as Divine and Infallible, or elſe his Faith cannot be Divine. But it is impoſſible to prove it to be Divine and Infallible, but by the Written word; and therefore, as it is not reaſonable that he ſhould believe the Written word by ſuch a Divine Teſtimony of the Church; ſo if any particular Doctrine may be received on the Authority of the Church without the Written word, then all Articles of Faith may, and ſo there would be no need of the Written word.

4. *The Faith of Chriſtians doth no otherwiſe ſtand upon the Foundation of the Churches Tradition*, than as it delivers down to us the Books of Scripture, but we acknowledg the general Senſe of the Chriſtian Church to be a very great help for underſtanding the true ſenſe of Scripture; and we do not reject any thing ſo delivered; but what is all this to the Church of *Rome*? But this is ſtill the way of true Repreſenting.

XVI. Of Councils.

HE *believes that the* Faith *of his Church may receive new* Additions *every day: And that he is not only oblig'd to believe what* Chriſt *taught, and his* Apoſtles; *but alſo every Definition or Decree, of any* General Council *aſſembled by the Command of the Pope. So that as often as any thing is iſſued out by the Authority of any of theſe* Church-Parliaments, *and order'd to be believ'd; he thinks himſelf under pain of Damnation, immediately bound to receive it; and having added it to his* Creed, *to aſſent to it with as Firm, Stedfaſt and Divine a Faith, as if it had been Commanded by Chriſt himſelf, and Decreed in the Conſiſtory of Heaven. And by this means he never comes to* underſtand *his Religion, or know what he is to* Believe; *but by the continual* Alterations, Additions, Diminutions, Interpretations, *of theſe*

HE believes that the Faith of his Church can receive *no Additions*; and that he is oblig'd to believe nothing, beſides that which *Chriſt* taught, and his *Apoſtles*; and if any thing contrary to this ſhould be defin'd and commanded to be believ'd, even by Ten thouſand *Councils*, he believes it *damnable* in any one to receive it, and by ſuch Decrees, to make *Additions* to his *Creed*. However, he maintains the Neceſſity and Right of *General Councils* lawfully Aſſembled; whoſe buſineſs it is, not to coin *new Articles* of *Faith*, or deviſe *Freſh Tenets*; but only, as often as any *Point* of Receiv'd Doctrine is impugned or call'd in queſtion; to debate the matter; and examine, what has been the Belief of all Nations (who are there preſent in their Prelates) in that Point. And this being

Councils he is preserv'd in a neceſſary Confuſion, *and tho he changes often, yet he fondly thinks himſelf always the ſame.*

being agreed on, to publiſh and make known to the World, which is the *Catholick Doctrine*, left by Chriſt and his Apoſtles; and which the *new-broach'd Error*. And by this means to prevent the loſs of infinite number of Souls, which might otherwiſe be deluded, and carried away after new inventions; not being capable by their own knowledge and abilities, to diſtinguiſh betwixt *Truth* and *Falſhood*, and diſcover the ſubtilties of every crafty *Deceiver*. And in this caſe he believes that he is oblig'd to ſubmit, and receive the Decrees of ſuch a *Council*; the Paſtors and Prelates there preſent, being by Chriſt and his Apoſtles appointed, for the deciſion of ſuch Controverſies. They having the *care* of that *flock* committed to them, *over which the Holy Ghoſt has made them Overſeers, to feed the Church of God*, Acts 20. 28. and to *watch* againſt thoſe men, who ſhould ariſe *from among themſelves, ſpeaking perverſe things to draw Diſciples after them.* Ib. verſ. 30. And *he* having receiv'd *Command*, as likewiſe the *whole Flock* of Chriſt, to *obey their Prelates, and to be ſubject to them, who watch, and are to render an account for their Souls*, *Heb.* 13. 17. with an aſſurance, That, *He that heareth them, heareth Chriſt; and he that deſpiſeth them, deſpiſeth Chriſt*, Luke 10. 16. And withal being taught, that as this way of the *Ancients* of the Church, and Prelates meeting, in caſe of any danger threatning their Flock, or any new Doctrine ariſing; was the means inſtituted by *Chriſt*, and practiſed by the *Apoſtles*, in the firſt planting of the Church, for the preventing *Schiſms*, and preſerving *Unity* among the Faithful, and that they ſhould *ſpeak and think the ſame thing, and be perfectly joyn'd together in the ſame mind, and ſame judgment*, 1 Cor. 1. 10 So it ought to be the means in all ſucceeding Ages, for the preventing *Diviſions*, and conſerving *Unity* among the *Faithful*. And that therefore, as that Controverſy concerning the *neceſſity of Circumciſion*, (*Act.* c. 15.) ariſing in the *Apoſtles* times, was not decided by any *private Perſon*, nor even by *Paul* and *Barnabas*, who nevertheleſs, had received the *Holy Ghoſt*; and one would have thought, might have pretended to the *Spirit*, and a Heavenly *Light*; but by a *General* Meeting of the *Apoſtles* and *Elders* of the Church at *Jeruſalem*, who were *conſulted* by *Paul* and *Barnabas* about *this Queſtion*. So all *other Diſputes and Difficulties of Religion* ariſing in *ſucceeding Ages*, ought to be referr'd to the *Succeſſors* of the *Apoſtles* (whoſe Charge, Dignity and Office is to continue to the end of the World, tho' they are dead in Perſon) who are to *conſider of the matter*, (*Acts* 15. 6.) as the *Apoſtles* did; while *all the Multitude keeps ſilence*, *ver.* 12. without any one *preſuming* on any *Learning*, *Gift*, *Virtue*, *Prayers or Inſpiration*, to intermeddle in the *Diſpute*, or put an end to the *Queſtion*: This being none of their buſineſs or obligation, but

but only with all *Patience* and *Humility* to expect the *Determination* of their *Prelates* and *Elders*, and receive it with the same expressions, as those *good Christians* did heretofore, who *rejoyced for the Consolation*, (*Acts* 15. 31.) And unless this that the *Apostles* did, and their *Obsequious Flock*, be taken as a *Pattern* in all Ages, for the ending such-like difficulties; he believes 'tis impossible that *Believers should stand fast in one Spirit, with one Mind*, (*Philip.* 1. 27.) and *be not carried away with divers and strange Doctrines* (*Hebr.* 13. 9.

XVI. *Of Councils.*

1. WE are glad to find so good a Resolution as seems to be expressed in these words, *viz. That he is obliged to believe nothing besides that which Christ taught, and his Apostles; and if any thing contrary to this should be defined, and commanded to be believed, even by Ten Thousand Councils, he believes it damnable in any one to receive it, and by such Decrees to make Additions to his Creed.* This seems to be a very good saying, and it is pity any thing else should overthrow it. But here lies the Misrepresenting; he will believe what Christ and his Apostles taught, from the Definitions of Councils; and so all this goodly Fabrick falls to nothing; for it is but as if one should say, If *Aristotle* should falsly deliver *Plato*'s sense, I will never believe him, but I am resolved to take *Plato*'s sense only from *Aristotle*'s Words. So here, he first declares he will take the Faith of Christ from the Church; and then he saith, if the Church Representative should contradict the Faith of Christ, he would never believe it.

2. We dispute not with them, the Right and Necessity of *General Councils*, (upon great occasions) if they be truly so, rightfully called, lawfully assembled, and fairly managed; which have been, and may be of great use to the Christian world, for setling the Faith, healing the Breaches of Christendom, and reforming Abuses. And we farther say, that the Decrees of such Councils ought to be submitted to, where they proceed upon certain Grounds of Faith, and not upon unwritten Traditions; which was the fatal stumbling at the threshold in the Council of *Trent*, and was not to be recovered afterwards; for their setting up Traditions equally with the written Word, made it it easie

for them to define, and as eaſie for all others to reject their Definitions, in caſe there had not been ſo many other Objections againſt the Proceedings of that Council. And ſo all our Diſpute concerning this matter is taken off from the general Notion, and runs into the particular Debate concerning the Qualifications and Proceedings of ſome which were called Free, General Councils; but were neither *General*, nor *Free*; and therefore *could not deliver the Senſe of the Catholick Church*, which our Author requires them to do.

XVIII. Of Infallibility in the Church.

HE *believes that the Paſtors and Prelates of his Church are* Infallible, *and that like ſo many Divine Oracles, or petty Familiar Deities, they are exempt from* Errour, *and cannot deceive. But this, eſpecially when they are met together in a* General Council; *It being a main part of his Faith, That then they are ſecure from all miſtakes; and that it is as impoſſible for them to decline either to the right hand or the left, in any of their Definitions and Decrees, as it is for God to leave Heaven, and become the Author of Lies. Thus fondly believing theſe to be aſſiſted with a neceſſary* Infallibility, *like Gods, whom their Ignorance, ill Example, and debauch'd Lives, to a true Conſiderer, ſcarce ſpeak to be Men. As if God Almighty did ſo blindly throw his Benefits and Graces amongſt his Creatures, that none ſhould have a more powerful aſſiſtance of Gods Truth and infallible Spirit, than thoſe in whom there was leaſt of God to be found.*

HE believes that the Paſtors and Prelates of his Church are *Fallible*; that there is none of them, but may fall into Errours, Hereſie and Schiſm, and conſequently are ſubject to miſtakes But that the whole Church can fail, or be deceiv'd in any one Point of Faith, this he believes impoſſible; knowing it to be built on *better Promiſes*; ſuch as ſecure her from all *Errour*, and danger of *Prevarication*. Her *Foundation* being laid by Chriſt, *againſt which the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail*, (Matthew 16. 18.) The *Power* that protects her, being *Chriſt* himſelf; *Behold I am with you all days*, (Matthew 28. 20.) The *Spirit* that *Guides* and *Teaches* her, being the *Comforter* of the *Holy Ghoſt*; *who ſhall teach her all things, and ſuggeſt to her all things that* Chriſt *has ſaid to her*, (*Joh.* 14. 16.) The *time* that ſhe is to be thus *protected, taught* and *aſſiſted*, being not only while the *Apoſtles* liv'd, or for the firſt three,

three, for or five hundred years next after; but *for ever*, to the end of the World, *Behold I am with you all days*, (Matthew 28. 20.) *He will give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever*, (*Joh.* 14. 16.) And the thing, that ſhe is to be thus taught to the end of the World, being *all Truth: He ſhall teach you all Truth*, (*Joh.* 16. 13.) Now being aſſured by theſe *Promiſes*, that the Church of Chriſt ſhall be taught all Truth by the ſpecial aſſiſtance of the *Holy Ghoſt*, to the end of the World; he has Faith to believe, that Chriſt will make his *Words* good; and that his Church ſhall never fail, nor be currupted with *Antichriſtian* Doctrine, nor be the Miſtreſs of *Errours*; but ſhall be taught all Truth, and ſhall teach all Truth to the Conſummation of things; and that *whoſoever hears her, hears* Chriſt: *And whoſoever deſpiſeth her, deſpiſes* Chriſt; *and ought to be eſteemed as an Heathen or a Publican*, Matthew 18. 17.) The like aſſiſtance of the *Holy Ghoſt*, he believes to be in all *General Councils*, which is the Church-*Repreſentative*: (as the *Parliament* is the *Repreſentative* of the Nation,) by which they are eſpecially protected from all *Errour*, in all Definitions and Declarations in matters of *Faith*. So that what the *Apoſtles* pronounc'd concerning the Reſult of their Council; (*Acts* 15. 28.) *It hath ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt, and to Us*; He does not doubt, may be prefix'd to all the *Determinations* in Point of *Faith*, reſolv'd on, by any *General Council lawfully* aſſembled ſince that time, or to be held to the Worlds end. The *Aſſiſtance* being to extend as far as the *Promiſe*. And though 'tis poſſible that ſeveral of the *Prelates* and *Paſtors* in ſuch an *Aſſembly*, (as alſo many others in Communion with the Chruch of Ghriſt) ſhould at other times, either through *Pride* or *Ignorance*, prevaricate, make Innovations in Faith, teach Erroneous Doctrines, and endeavour to draw Numbers after them; yet he is taught, that this does not at all argue a *Fallibility* in the Church; nor prejudice her *Faith*, but only the *Perſons*, that thus unhappily fall into theſe Errours, and cut themſelves off from being Members of the Myſtical *Body* of Chriſt upon Earth: Whilſt the *Belief* of the Church remains pure and untainted; and experiences the Truth of what Saint *Paul* foretold, That *Grievous Wolves ſhall enter in among you, not ſparing the Flock: Alſo of your own ſelves ſhall Men ariſe, ſpeaking perverſe things, to draw away Diſciples after them*, (*Act.* 20. *v.* 29, 30.) which, as it prov'd true even in the *Apoſtles* time by the Fall of *Nicholas* and his Followers, as alſo ſeveral others: So it has been verified in all Ages ſince, by turbulent and preſuming Spirits, broaching new Doctrines, and making *Separations* and *Schiſms*: But this without caſting any more Aſperſion on the Church or Congregation of the *Faithful*, than the Fall of *Judas* did on the *Apoſtles*; or the *Rebellion* of *Lucifer* on the Hierarchy of *Angels*; which was no more than that ſuch wicked and preſuming Spirits;

went out from amongſt them, and were *expell'd* their Communion, as unworthy. Neither does it reflect at all on the Churches *Authority*, or make the Truth of her Doctrine queſtionable to him; that many of her eminent Members, Doctors, Prelates, and leading Men, have been, or are great enormous Sinners, infamous for their *Pride*, *Covetouſneſs*, or other *Vices*, whatſoever: The *Promiſes* of God's *continual and un-interrupted Aſſiſtance* to his Church, being not to be fruſtrated by the Wickedneſs of ſuch particular Men, though in great Dignities. Theſe *Promiſes* being made ſurer to her, than ever the *Jewiſh* Church: Which nevertheleſs ſtood firm in her *Authority*, and the *Delivery of Truth*, notwithſtanding the frequent *Idolatry* of the People, *Nadab* and *Abihu*'s (conſecrated Prieſts) offering *ſtrange Fire*: *Corah*, *Dathan* and *Abiram*'s making a great *Schiſm*, and the Sins of *Moſes* and *Aaron*, and other High-Prieſts in all her ſucceeding Ages. Nay, though all things touching Religion and Virtue, were in a manner run to decay, in our Saviour's time, both in Prieſts and People; yet did he maintain the *Authority* of the *Jewiſh* Church; and commanded all to be Obedient, and ſubmit to thoſe who had the Superiority; without calling in queſtion their Authority, or doubting of the Reaſonableneſs of their Commands. *The Scribes and Phariſees*, (ſays he, *Matth.* 23. 2.) *ſit in* Moſes's *Chair*: *All therefore, whatſoever they bid you obſerve, that obſerve, and do*: *But do ye not after their Works*. If therefore God's *ſpecial Aſſiſtance* was never wanting to the Church of the *Jews*, ſo as to let it fail in the *Truth* of its *Doctrine*, or its *Authority*; notwithſtanding the Pride, Covetouſneſs, Cruelty, Impiety, Idolatry, of many of her *Levites*, *Elders*, *Prieſts* and *High-Prieſts*. Why ſhould not he believe the ſame of the Church of Chriſt, which, (as Saint *Paul* ſays) *is built on better Promiſes*; and that it remains entire in the *Truth* of her *Doctrine*, and her *Authority*, notwithſtanding the Viciouſneſs of many of her *Governours*. Eſpecially, ſince he's in a manner confident, that there has been nothing ſo infamous acted by any *Prieſts*, *Prelates*, *Popes* or others, ſince Chriſt's time, but what may be follow'd; Nay, was out-done by the *Prieſts* of the *Jews*.

XVII. *Of*

XVII. *Of Infallibility in the Church.*

1. HE doth not pretend this belongs *to the Paſtors and Prelates of his Church, who may fall*, he ſaith, *into Hereſie and Schiſm; but that the whole Church is ſecured by Divine Promiſes from all Error and danger of Prevarication*; which he proves from *the Promiſes of the New Teſtament, Mat.* 16. 18---28. 20. *John* 14. 16, 26. But however the former ſeems to take away Infallibility from the Guides of the Church, yet that this is to be underſtood of them *ſeperately*, appears by what follows.

2. *The like Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt he believes to be in all General Councils, which is the Church Repreſentative; by which they are ſpecially protected from all error in all definitions and declarations in matters of Faith.*

Now here are two ſorts of Infallibility tacked to one another by vertue of theſe general Promiſes, which ought more diſtinctly to be conſidered.

1. To preſerve Chriſts Church ſo as it ſhall never ceaſe to be a Church, is one thing; to preſerve it from all Errors is another: The former anſwers the End of Chriſts Promiſes as to the *Duration* of the *Church*; and the latter is not implied in them.

2. The promiſe of *teaching them all Truth*, Joh. 16. 13. is not made to the whole Church, but to the *Apoſtles*: And their caſe was ſo peculiar and extraordinary, that there can be no juſt inference from the aſſiſtance promiſed to them, of what the Church ſhould enjoy in all Ages.

3. If the diffuſive Church have no infallible Aſſiſtance promiſed, then no infallible Aſſiſtance can from thence be proved for the Church Repreſentative; ſo that ſome particular Promiſes to the Guides of the Church as aſſembled together, are neceſſary to prove the Infallibility of Councils.

4. It by no means proves following Councils to be Infallible, becauſe the Apoſtles ſaid, *Acts* 15. 28. *It ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt, and to us.* Our Author *doth not doubt, but the ſame may be prefixed to all determinations in point of Faith, reſolved on by any General Council lawfully aſſembled ſince that time, or to be held to the Worlds end.* But what Reaſon he had for not doubting in this matter, I cannot ſee; the *Aſſiſtance*, he ſaid, *being to extend*

as

as far as the Promiſe: But ſhall *Aſſiſtance* imply *Infallibility*? Then there muſt be good ſtore, as long as the Promiſes of Divine Grace hold good: But this Aſſiſtance of Councils is very different from the Aſſiſtance of Grace, for the Church may ſubſiſt without Councils, but cannot without Grace: What General Council was there from the meeting, *Acts* 15. to the Council of *Nice*? Were not Chriſt's Promiſes fulfilled to his Church all that time, when it encreaſed in all parts againſt the moſt violent Oppoſition?

5. No parity of Reaſon from the *Jewiſh* Church can be ſufficient proof for Infallibility in the Chriſtian. But our Author argues thus, *If Gods ſpecial Aſſiſtance was never wanting to the Church of the Jews ſo as to let it fail in the truth of its Doctrine, or its Authority; Why ſhould not he believe the ſame of the Church of Chriſt, which is built on better Promiſes?* What ſpecial Aſſiſtance was it which *Iſrael* had, when it is ſaid, that *for a long time Iſrael had been without the true God, and without a teaching Prieſt, and without Law?* And as to *Judah*, was there no failing in point of Doctrine in our Saviours time? It is true they had the Law intire, and that was all that was good among them; for their Teachers had corrupted themſelves and the people, and made the Law of no effect among them: If there were Infallibility any where it muſt be in the High Prieſt and *Sanhedrim*; but is it poſſible for any Chriſtian to think them Infallible, when they were ſo groſly miſtaken about the main Article of their Faith as to the Meſſias, and pronounced him worthy of Death? Is not this a fine Argument for the Infallibility of the Guides of the Chriſtian Church? *But the Church of Chriſt hath better Promiſes:* No doubt of it, greater Promiſes of Grace and Mercy in this World, and in that to come: but what is all this to Infallibility in Councils?

2 Chr. 15. 3.

6. Chriſt's Command of Obedience to thoſe who ſat in *Moſes* Chair, (*Matth.* 23. 2.) doth not prove the Infallibility of thoſe who ſat there. Yet this is alledged to that purpoſe; and that men ought not to doubt of the Reaſonableneſs of the Commands of their Superiors. But St. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith, *our Saviour ſpeaks of the things commanded by the Law of* Moſes. *Per Cathedram Doctrinam Legis oſtendit*, ſaith St. *Jerome*; *Not their own Doctrine, but that of* Moſes, ſaith *Iſidore*; and ſo *Hilary* and *Theophylact*. *Maldonate* confeſſeth, our Saviours Words are to be underſtood, not of their own Doctrine, but of that of the Law

Chryſoſt. in Mat. Hom. 73
Hieron. in loc.
Caten. Gr. in loc.
Hilar. Canon. 24.
Theophilact. in loc.

Law; and therefore he yields the Obedience here required is to be reſtrained to that; *All things*, ſaith *Cajetan*, *which they teach out of* Moſes's *Chair: Not all their Doctrines, but as far as they were conformable to the Law*, ſaith *Ferus*. Now, can any one hence infer, that no men ought to diſpute any Commands of Superiors, when it is ſuppoſed, that there is a Rule and Standard for them to ſpeak according to; and our Saviour elſewhere doth ſuppoſe theſe very men to teach things contrary to the Law; as in the Caſe of *Corban*. Would our Saviour contradict himſelf? or require a blind Obedience in things repugnant to the Law? We do not deny a due ſubmiſſion to our Superiors in the Church; yea, we allow them a Power to determine things not forbidden; and think Obedience due in ſuch things by vertue of their Authority: but yet this is far enough from Infallibility, or an unlimited implicit Obedience, which would overthrow the force of all our Saviour's Reaſonings againſt the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, as to their miſinterpreting the Law, and the Superſtitious Practiſes they impoſed upon the people. Matt. 15.

XVIII. Of the POPE.

HE *believes the* Pope *to be his* great God, *and to be far above all the* Angels. *That Chriſt is no longer* Head *of the* Church, *but that this* Holy Father *hath taken his place; and that whatſoever he Orders, Decrees or Commands, is to be received by his* Flock, *with the ſame reſpect, ſubmiſſion and awe, as if Chriſt had ſpoken it by his own mouth. For that his* Holineſs *(having once receiv'd the* Triple-Crown *on his Head,) is now no more to be look'd upon as* Man, *but as* Chriſt's Vicar, *whoſe Office it is to Conſtitute and Or-*

HE believes the *Pope* to be none of his God, neither *Great* nor *Little*; That he is not above the *Angels*, but only a *Man*. He believes that *Chriſt*, as he is *ſupreme Maſter, Governour* and *Lord* of all created things, ſo alſo of his Church, of which he acknowledges him to be the *Founder* and *Head*. But as notwithſtanding this *Lordſhip* and *Headſhip* of Chriſt over all things, every *Father* of a *Family* owns himſelf to be *Maſter* of it under Chriſt; every petty *Commander* of a Ship ſtiles himſelf

dain ſuch things as Chriſt forgot, when he was upon Earth, not throughly conſidering, what would be the Exigencies of his Flock *in future Ages. And for this intent, he is aſſiſted with a certain* Myſterious Infallibility; *ſuch as hides it ſelf, when he is upon his own* Private Concerns, *expoſes him to all the Deſigns, Cheats, Malice, and Machinations of his Enemies, and lets him be as eaſily over-ſeen, as imprudent, as ſilly as his Neighbours. But when he comes into his* Chair, *to bear any* Publick Buſineſs, *then it begins to appear, and protects him from all* Miſtakes *and* Errors; *and he becomes immediately full of the* Holy Ghoſt, *though he had the Devil and all of Wickedneſs in him juſt before.*

himſelf *Maſter of it under God*; and every Prince, King, and Emperour is confeſs'd *ſupreme Lord and Governour* of his Dominions *under God*: So alſo, he believes, that there is a *Paſtor, Governour* and *Head* of *Chriſt's Church* under *Chriſt*, to wit, the *Pope* or *Biſhop* of *Rome*, who is the Suceſſor of St. *Peter*, to whom Chriſt committed the care of his *Flock*; and who hath been follow'd now by a *viſible Succeſſion* of above 250 Biſhops acknowledg'd as ſuch in all Ages, by the Chriſtian World. And now believing the *Pope* to enjoy this Dignity, he looks upon himſelf oblig'd to ſhew him that Reſpect, Submiſſion and Obedience, which is due to his place; a thing which no body can in reaſon or conſcience deny to any one in *Rule*, or that has any *Superiority*. Neither does he doubt but God aſſiſts thoſe who have this *charge*, with a *particular helping Grace*, ſuch as has a ſpecial reſpect to the *Office* and *Function*, more than to the *Perſon*. Such was given to all the *Prophets*, when they were ſent to preach: Such to *Moſes*, when he was *made God* to *Pharaoh*, *Exod.* 7. 1. Such to the *ſeventy Elders*, when God *taking of the Spirit of* Moſes, *gave it unto them*, & conſtituted them *Judges*. Such to *Caiphas*, who to council, propheſied of the death of Chriſt, which St. *John* aſcrib'd not to his *Perſon*, but to his *Office* of *High-Prieſt*, Job 11. 51. *And this ſpake he not of himſelf, but being High-Prieſt that year, he Propheſied, that* Jeſus *ſhould die for that Nation.* By priviledge of his *Office*, uttering a *Truth*, which he himſelf never meant. With ſuch like *helping Grace*, he doubts not, but God generally aſſiſts the *Paſtors* of the *New-Law*, and more eſpecially the *High-Prieſt*, for the *Good* of the whole Flock. And therefore, tho' he were as wicked as *Caiphas*, yet he is ready to tender him all *reſpect* due to his Function, and obey him in every thing concerning the *Exerciſe* of his *charge*, not for any conſideration of his *Perſon*, but meerly for the *Office* he bears: It being the Duty of a *good Son* to *Obey* his *Father*, and of a *Loyal* Subject *his King*, and never to queſtion their *Authority*, or diſ-reſpect them in their *Office*, tho' for ſome particular Vices, they may have little reſpect for their *perſons*. In this manner is he ready to behave himſelf towards his *chief Paſtor*, with all Reverence and Submiſſion, never ſcrupling to receive his *Decrees*, and

Diſ-

Definitions, ſuch as are iſſued forth by his *Authority*, with all their due circumſtances, and according to the Law, in the concern of the whole *Flock*. And this, whether he has the Aſſiſtance of a *Divine Infallibility*, or no: Which, though ſome allow him, without being in a *General Council*, yet he is ſatisfied, 'tis only their *Opinion*, and not their *Faith*, there being no Obligation from the *Church*, of aſſenting to any ſuch Doctrine. And therefore, as in any Civil Governments, the Sentence of the *ſupreme Judge* or *Higheſt Tribunal*, is to be *obey'd*, though there be no aſſurance of *Infallibility*, or *Divine Protection* from Error or Miſtake: So is he taught, ſhould be done to the Orders of the *Supreme Paſtors*, whether he be *Infallible* or no.

XVIII. *Of the* POPE.

1. WE do not charge them with *Believing the Pope to be God*; which it ſeems himſelf did, if we believe the *Miſrepreſenter* in his Preface: but there is ſome Reaſon to doubt whether they do not at ſome times give him greater Honour than becomes a Man. I inſtance in the Adoration after his Election, when the new Pope is placed upon the Altar to receive the Submiſſions of the Cardinals: but the Altar, themſelves do confeſs, to be ſacred to God alone: And there they profeſs to Worſhip Jeſus Chriſt, as preſent in the Hoſt. This therefore looks too much like aſſuming the Place of Chriſt, and not becoming the Diſtance between God and Man. *Cerem.* §. 1. c. 2.

2. The Queſtion is, *Whether Chriſt hath appointed the Pope or Biſhop of* Rome *to be Paſtor, Governour, and Head of his Church under him?* *This*, he ſaith, *he believes*, and this he knows we deny, and therefore had reaſon to expect ſome proof of it, But inſtead thereof he tells us *how they look on themſelves as obliged to ſhew him the Reſpect due to his place*, which he knows is not the matter in queſtion. Two things however he ſaith, which ſeem to juſtifie his Title.

1. *He is the Succeſſor of St.* Peter, *to whom Chriſt committed the Care of his Flock.* But how far is this from proving the Pope to be Head of the Church under Chriſt? For, how doth it appear that Chriſt ever made St. *Peter* Head of the Church, or committed his Flock to him, in contradiſtinction

to the reſt of the Apoſtles? This is ſo far from being evident from Scripture, that the Learned Men of their Church are aſhamed of the Places commonly produced for it; it being impoſſible ever to juſtify the ſenſe of them according to their own Rules of interpreting Scripture, *viz.* by the unanimous conſent of the Fathers For,

Matt. 16. 18. *Chryſoſt.* hom. 1. in Pentec. Tom. 5. ed. Savil. p. 979. *Ambroſ.* de Incarnat. Dom. Sacramento c. 5. *Auguſt.* de Verbis Dom. ad Evang. ſecund. Matth.

1. *Thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock will I build my Church*, is interpreted by many of the Fathers both *Greek* and *Latin*, of S. *Peters* Confeſſion, and not of his Perſon; ſo by S. *Chryſoſtom*, S. *Ambroſe*, S. *Auguſtine*, S. *Baſil* of *Seluciæ*, S. *Hilary*, S. *Gregory Nyſſen*, and *Theodoret*; all great and conſiderable Perſons in the Chriſtian Church, whoſe words are plain and full to that purpoſe; and ſo they can never produce the unanimous Conſent of the Fathers for S. *Peter*'s Supremacy out of theſe words.

Serm. 13. Tract. in Joh. 124. *Baſil. Seluc.* Orat. 25. ad fin. *Hilar.* de Trinit. *l.* 6. *Greg. Nyſſen* de Advent. Domini cap. ult. *Theodoret* Epiſt. 77. 146. Matt. 16. 19.

Orig. Comment. in Mat. Gr. Lat. p. 275. *Cyprian* de Unit. Eccleſiæ.

2. *And unto thee will I give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, are interpreted by the Fathers, of S. *Peter* in common with the other Apoſtles; ſo *Origen*, S. *Cyprian*, S. *Hilary*, S. *Hierom*, and S. *Auguſtine*, as they are all owned by ſome Members of the *Roman* Communion.

Hilar. de Trinit. l. 6. *Hier.* c. Jovin. l. 1. c. 14. in Matt. 16. *Aug.* in Joh. Tr. 118. 124. in Epiſt. Joh. To. 10.

Moyens ſurs & honeſtes, &c. p. 34. &c. Entretiens de Philaleth. et Philoren. p. 121. Joh. Launoi. Epiſt. part 5. Reim. Formentino, & Part. 2. Ep. 5. p. 47, &c.

And, 3. For theſe words, *Feed my Sheep*, a late learned Doctor of the *Sorbon* ſhews, that if they prove any thing peculiar to Saint *Peter*, they muſt prove him ſole Paſtor of the Church, which was the thing Saint *Gregory* diſputed againſt ſo warmly. But that there was nothing peculiar to Saint *Peter*, above or beyond the reſt of the Apoſtles, he ſhews at large from S. *Chryſoſtom*, S. *Cyril*, S. *Auguſtine*, and others, to whom I refer the Reader, and to the former Authors. But ſuppoſe it were made to appear, *that Saint* Peter *was Head of the Church*; How doth the Biſhop of *Rome*'s Succeſſion in that Headſhip ſhew it ſelf?

To that he ſaith, 2. *That there hath been a viſible Succeſſion of above Two hundred and fifty Biſhops, acknowled as ſuch in all*

paſt

paſt Ages by the Chriſtian World. As ſuch: What is that? As Biſhops of *Rome?* That is not of weight enough to put it upon Tryal; as *Heads* of the *Catholick-Church?* That he knows is not only denied by us, but by all the *Greek*, *Armenian*, *Neſtorian*, *Abyſſin* Churches; ſo that we dare ſay, it was never allowed in any one Age of the Chriſtian Church. But we need not inſiſt on the proof of this, ſince the late mentioned Authors of the *Roman* Communion have taken ſo great pains, not only to prove the Popes Supremacy to be an Incroachment & Uſurpation in the Church, but that the laying it aſide is neceſſary to the Peace and Unity of it. And until the Divine Inſtitution of the Papal Supremacy be proved, it is to no purpoſe to debate *what manner of Aſſiſtance is promiſed to the Pope in his Decrees.* Our Author is willing to decline the Debate about his *perſonal Infallibility, as a matter of Opinion, and not of Faith*; and yet he ſaith, *he doubts not but God doth grant a ſpecial Aſſiſtance to the High Prieſt, for the good of the whole Flock, under the New Law, as he did under the Old, and produces the Inſtance of* Caiaphas, Joh. 11. 51. This is a very ſurprizing way of Reaſoning; for if his Arguments be good from Scripture, he muſt hold the Popes *perſonal Infallibility* as *a matter of Faith*; and yet one would hardly think he ſhould build an Article of Faith on the inſtance of *Caiaphas:* For what conſequence can be drawn from Gods over-ruling the Mind of a very bad man, when he was carrying on a moſt wicked deſign, to utter ſuch words, which in the event proved true in another ſenſe than he meant them, that therefore God will give a ſpecial Aſſiſtance to the Pope in determining matters of Faith? Was not *Caiaphas* himſelf the man who propoſed the taking away the Life of Chriſt at that time? Was he aſſiſted in that Council? Did not he determine afterwards Chriſt to be guilty of Blaſphemy, and therefore worthy of Death? And is not this a rare Infallibility which is ſuppoſed to be conſiſtent with a Decree to crucifie Chriſt? And doth he in earneſt think ſuch Orders are to be obeyed, whether the Supreme Paſtor be Infallible or not? For ſo he concludes, *That his Sentence is to be obeyed, whether he be Infallible or no?*

XIX. Of Diſpenſations.

HE *believes, that the* Pope *has Authority to* piſpenſe *with the Laws of God; and abſolve any one from the obligation of keeping the Commandments. So that, if he has but his* Holy Fathers *leave, he may confidently* Diſſemble, Lie, *and* Forſwear *himſelf in all whatſoever he pleaſes, and never be in danger of being call'd to an account at the* laſt day; *eſpecially if his* Lying *and* Forſwearing *was for the common good of the* Church: *there being then a* ſure Reward *prepar'd for him in Heaven, as a recompence of his good Intentions and Heroick Atchievements. And if at any time he ſhould chance to be catch'd in the management of any of theſe publick and* Church-concerns, *and being obnoxious to* Penal *Laws, ſhould have Sentence of Death paſs'd on him; he has liberty at his laſt hour on the* Scaffold *or* Ladder, *to make a publick Deteſtation of all ſuch Crimes, to make proteſtations of his* Innocence; *to call God to witneſs, that he denies unjuſtly; and that as he is immediately to appear before the Supreme* Judge, *he knows no more of any ſuch deſigns, and is as clear from the Guilt of them as the Child unborn. And this, though the* Evidence *againſt him be as clear as noon-day, though the* Jury *be never ſo* Impartial, *and the* Judge *never ſo* Conſcientious. *For that he having taken the* Sacrament *and* Oath of Secreſie, *and receiv'd* Abſolution, *or a* Diſpenſation

HE believes, that the *Pope* has no Authority to *diſpenſe* with the *Law* of God; and that there's no *Power* upon Earth can *abſolve* any one frome the Obligation of keeping the Commandments; or give leave to *Lie* or *Forſwear*; or make, that the breaking of any the *leaſt* Divine Precept, ſhall not be accountable for at the day of Judgment. He is taught by his *Church* in all Books of Direction, in all Catechiſms, in all Sermons, that every *Lie* is a Sin; that to call God to witneſs to an *Untruth damnable*; that it ought not to be done to ſave the whole World; that whoſoever does it, either for his own *perſonal* account, or for the Intereſt of *Church* or *Pope*, or whatſoever elſe, muſt of neceſſity anſwer for it at the laſt day, and expect his portion with the Devil and his Angels, if unrepented: And that no one can give leave for *Lying*, *Perjury*, or committing any Sin; or even pretend to it, unleſs it be the Devil himſelf, or ſome deviliſh *Miniſters* of his, ſuch as he deteſts in his heart, and utterly abominates. And in conſequence to this believes, that whoſoever at the hour of his death denies any Crime, of which he is guilty, and proteſts himſelf to be innocent, when he is not ſo; can have no hope of Mercy: but departing out of this World, an enemy to God, and the Truth, ſhall infallibly be

from the Pope, *may then* Lye, Swear, Forſwear, *and* Proteſt *all that he pleaſes, without ſcruple, with a good Conſcience, Chriſtian-like, Holily and Canonically.*

be receiv'd as ſuch in the next; and dying with a *Lye* in his mouth, can expect no reward, but from the Father of Lies. And this, whatſoever his Crime was, whether incurr'd by an undertaking for *Mother-Church*, or no; and whatſoever his pretences for the denial of the Truth were, whether *Abſolutions*, *Diſpenſations*, the *Sacrament*, or *Oath of Secreſie*, or whatſoever elſe: nothing of theſe being capable of excuſing him in *Lies* or *Perjury*, or making them to be *Innocent*, and not diſpleaſing to God. Nor indeed did he ever hear of theſe ſo much talk'd on, *Diſpenſations* and *Abſolutions*, from any Prieſts of his *Church*, either in Sermons or Confeſſions; he never read of them in his Books and Catechiſms; he never ſaw the Practice of them in any of his *Communion*; it having been their Cuſtom, ever ſince *Oaths* were firſt devis'd againſt them, rather to ſuffer the loſs of their goods, baniſhments, impriſonments, torments, and death it ſelf, than *Forſwear* themſelves, or proteſt the leaſt Untruth. And 'tis not out of the memory of man, that ſeveral might have ſaved their Eſtates, and Lives too, would they have ſubſcrib'd to, and own'd but *one Lye*, and yet refus'd it; chuſing rather to die infamouſly, than prejudice their Conſcience with an *Untruth*. So that it ſeems a great Myſtery to him, that thoſe of his Profeſſion, ſhould have Leave and *Diſpenſations* to Lye and forſwear themſelves at pleaſure, and yet that they ſhould need nothing elſe but *Lying* and *Perjury*, for the quiet enjoyment of their Eſtates, for the ſaving their Lives, for the obtaining Places of higheſt Command, and greateſt Dignity; ſuch as would be extraordinarily advantagious for their Cauſe, and the intereſt of their Church. And yet that they ſhould generally chuſe rather to forego all theſe ſo conſiderable Conveniences, that once *Lie* or *Forſwear* themſelves. And is it not another great Myſtery, that theſe *Diſpenſations* for Lying and Swearing ſhould be according to the *Receiv'd Doctrine* of his *Church*; and yet that he, or any of his Communion, were never inſtructed nor inform'd of any ſuch Diabolical Point? nay, had never come to the knowledge of it, had it not been for the information receiv'd from ſome Zealous Adverſaries, ſuch as relate either meerly *upon Truſt*, or elſe ſuch as have receiv'd a *Diſpenſation* of Lying from the Devil, that they might charge the like Doctrine on the Church of *Rome*, and the *Pope*.

XIX. *Of*

XIX. *Of Diſpenſations.*

HEre the *Miſrepreſenter* ſaith, That a Papiſt believes that the Pope hath Authority to diſpence with the Laws of God, and abſolve any one from the Obligation of keeping the Commandments. On the other ſide, the *Repreſenter* affirms; *That the Pope has no Authority to diſpence with the Law of God, and that there's no Power upon Earth can abſolve any one from the Obligation of keeping the Commandments:* This matter is not to be determined by the one's affirming, and the others denying; but by finding out, if poſſible, the true ſenſe of the Church of *Rome* about this matter. And there are three Opinions about it.

De Conceſſ. Præbend è propoſuit. Abb. c. propoſuit de Conc. Præbend. C. 5. Q. 6. c. Auctoritate.

1. Of thoſe who aſſert, *That the Pope hath a Power of Diſpenſing in any Divine Law, except the Articles of Faith.* The Gloſs upon the Canon Law ſaith, that where the Text ſeems to imply, that the Pope cannot diſpence againſt the Apoſtle, it is to be underſtood of Articles of Faith: And *Panormitan* ſaith, This Expoſition pleaſes him well; for the Pope may diſpenſe in all other things: *Contra Apoſtolum diſpenſat*, ſaith the Gloſs on the Decree: And the *Roman* Editors in the Margin, refer to 34 *Diſt. c. Lector* to prove it: And there indeed the Gloſs is very plain in the Caſe, *ſic Ergo Papa diſpenſat contra Apoſtolum:* And the *Roman* Correcters there juſtifie it, and ſay it is no abſurd Doctrine as to poſitive Inſtitutions: But the former *notable Gloſs*, as *Panormitan* calls it, ſets down the particulars wherein the Pope may diſpenſe. As, 1. Againſt the Apoſtles and their Canons. 2. Againſt the Old Teſtament. 3. In Vows. 4. In Oaths. The *Summa Angelica* ſaith, the Pope may diſpenſe as to all the Precepts of the Old Teſtament. And *Clavaſius* founds this Power upon the Plenitude of the Popes Power, according to that Expreſſion in the Decretal mentioned, that he can, *ex plenitudine poteſtatis de Jure ſupra Jus diſpenſare*; and without ſuch a Power, he ſaith, God would not have taken that care of his Church, which was to be expected from his Wiſdom. *Jacobatius* brings ſeveral Inſtances of this Power in the Pope, and refers to the *Speculator* for more. *Jac. Almain* ſaith, That all the Canoniſts are of Opinion, that the Pope may diſpenſe againſt the Apoſtle, and many of their Divines, but not all: For,

Sum. Angelic. v. diſpenſatio.

Jacobat. de Conciliis l. 5. p. 215.

Almain de Poteſt. Eccleſiæ c. 12.

2. Some of their Divines held *that the Pope could not diſpence with*

with the Law of God, as that implies a proper *relaxation* of the *Law*, but could only *Authoritatively declare* that the Law did not oblige in such a particular Case; because an Inferiour could not take away the force of a Superiors Law; and otherwise there would be no fixed and immutable Rule in the Church; and if the Pope might dispense in one Law of God, he might dispense in the rest. And of this Opinion were some of the most eminent School-Divines, as *Thomas Aquinas*, *Bonaventure*, *Major*, *Soto*, and *Catharinus*, who at large debates this Question, and denies that the Pope hath any Power to dispense with Gods Law: But then he adds, that the Pope hath a kind of *propheti-cal Power* to *declare* in what Cases the Law doth oblige, and in what not; which he parallels with the Power of *declaring* the *Canon of Scripture*; and this he doth not by his own Authority, but by Gods; He confesseth the Pope cannot dispense with those Precepts which are of themselves indispensable; nor alter the Sacraments; but then, saith he, there are some Divine Laws, which have a general force, but in particular Cases may be dispensed with; and in these cases the Law is to be relaxed, so that the Relaxation seems to come from God himself: But he confesses this Power is not to be often made use of; so that he makes this Power to be no Act of Jurisdiction, but of *propheti-cal Interpretation*, as he calls it; and he brings the Instance of *Caiaphas* to this purpose: And he adds, that the difference between the Divines and *Canonists* was but in Terms; for the *Canonists* were in the right as to the Power, and the Divines in the manner of explaining it.

Catharin. c. Cajetan. 6. p. 524.

3. Others have thought this too loose a way of explaining the Popes Power, and therefore they say, *That the Pope hath not a bare declaratory Power, but a real Power of dispensing in a proper sense in particular Cases*: For, say they, the other is no act of Jurisdiction, but of Discretion, and may belong to other men as well as to the Pope; but this they look on as more agreeable to the Popes Authority and Commission; and a bare declaratory Power would not be sufficient for the Churches Necessity; as *Sanchez* shews at large, and quotes many Authors for this Opinion; and *Sayr* more; and he saith *the Practice of the Church cannot be justified without it*: Which *Suarez* much insists upon; and without it, he saith, *the Church hath fallen into intolerable Errors*; and *it is evident*, he saith, *the Church hath granted real Dispensations, and not meer Declarations*. And he founds it

Sanchez. de Mattrim l. 8. Dis. 6. n. 5. Sayr. Clavis Reg. l. 5. c. 11. *Suarez* de vot. l. 6. c. 9. n. 7, 8, 9, 17.

it upon Christ's Promise to *Peter*, *To thee will I give the Keys*, and the Charge to him, *Feed my Sheep*. But then he explains this Opinion, by saying that it is no formal Dispensation with the Law of God, but the matter of the Law is changed or taken away.

Thus I have briefly laid together the different Opinions in the Church of *Rome* about this power of dispensing with the Law of God, from which it appears, that they do all consent in the thing, but differ only in the manner of explaining it.

And I am therefore afraid our *Representer* is a very unstudied Divine, and doth not well understand their own Doctrine, or he would never have talked so boldly and unskilfully in this matter.

As to what he pretends, that *their Church teaches that every Lye is a Sin*, &c. it doth not teach the Case; for the Question it not, whether their Church teach men to lye, but whether there be not such a power in the Church, as by altering the nature of things, may not make that not to be a Lye, which otherwise would be one: As their Church teaches that men ought not to break their Vows; yet no one among them questions, but the Pope may dissolve the Obligation of a Vow, although it be made to God himself. Let him shew then, how the Pope comes to have a Power to release a Vow made to God, and not to have a Power to release the Obligation to veracity among men.

Again, We do not charge them with delivering any such Doctrine, *That men may have Dispensations to lye and forswear themselves at pleasure*; for we know this Dispensing Power is to be kept up as a great Mystery, and not to be made use of, but upon weighty and urgent causes, of great consequence and benefit to the Church, as their Doctors declare. But as to all matters of fact, which he alludes to, I have nothing to say to them; for our Debate is only, whether there be such a Power of Dispensation allowed in the Church of *Rome*, or not?

XX. Of the Depoſing Power.

HE *believes, that the* Pope *has Authority to* diſpence *with his* Allegiance *to his* Prince; *and that he needs no longer be a* Loyal *Subject, and maintain the Rights, Priviledges and Authority of his* King, *than the* Pope *will give him leave. And that if this* Mighty Father *think fit to thunder out an* Excommunication *againſt him, then he ſhall be deem'd the beſt Subject, and Moſt Chriſtian that can firſt ſhed his Prince's Blood, and make him a* Sacrifice *to* Rome: *and he's but ill rewarded for his pains, who, after ſo Glorious an Atchievement, has not his Name plac'd in the Kalendar, and he Canoniz'd for a Saint. So that there can be no greater Danger to a King, than to have* Popiſh *Subjects, he holding his Life amongſt them, only at the* Pope's *pleaſure.*

'TIS no part of his *Faith* to believe, that the *Pope* has *Authority* to diſpence with his *Allegiance* to his Sovereign, or that he can *Depoſe Princes* upon any account whatſoever; giving leave to their Subjects to take up Arms againſt them, and endeavour their ruin. He knows that *Depoſing* & *King-killing* Power has been maintain'd by ſome *Canoniſts*, and *Divines* of his *Church*, and that it is in their *Opinion* lawful, and annex'd to the Papal Chair. He knows likewiſe that ſome *Popes* have endeavor'd to act according to *this* Power. But that this Doctrine, appertains to the *Faith* of his *Church*, and is to be believ'd by all of that *Communion*, is a malicious *Calumny*, a down-right *Falſity*. And for the truth of this, it ſeems to him a ſufficient Argument, that for the few Authors that are Abettors of this Doctrine, there are of his Communion three times the number that publickly diſown all ſuch *Authority*; beſides ſeveral *Univerſities*, and *whole Bodies* that have ſolemnly condemn'd it; without being in the leaſt ſuſpected of their *Religion*, or of denying any Article of their *Faith*. Thoſe other Authors therefore Publiſh their own *Opinions* in their Books, and thoſe *Popes* acted according to what they judg'd lawful; and all this amounts to no more, than that this Doctrine has been, or is an *Opinion* amongſt ſome of his Church; but to raiſe it to an Article of *Faith* upon theſe grounds, is impoſſible. Let his *Church* therefore anſwer for no more, than what ſhe delivers for *Faith*; let *Prelates* anſwer for their *Actions*, and *Authors* for their own *Opinions*; otherwiſe more *Churches* muſt be charg'd with *Depoſing* and *King-killing* Doctrine, beſides that of *Rome*: The *Univerſity* of *Oxford* having found other Authors of *Pernicious Books, and Damnable Doctrines, deſtructive to the Sacred Perſons of Princes, their State and*

Government, beſides *Jeſuits*, as may be ſeen in their *Decree*, publiſhed in the *London Gazette*, *July* 26. 1683. In which they condemn'd twenty ſeven *falſe, impious, ſeditious Propoſitions, fitted to ſtir up Tumults, overthrow States and Kingdoms, to lead to Rebellion, Murder of Princes, and Atheiſm it ſelf.* Of which number only three or four were aſcrib'd to the *Jeſuits:* the reſt having been of *another Communion* for their *Fathers.* And this Doctrine was not firſt condemn'd by *Oxford*; What they did here in the Year 1683. having been ſolemnly done in *Paris* in 1626. Where the whole Colledge of *Sorbon* gave Sentence againſt this Propoſition of *Sanctarellus*; (viz.) *That the Pope, for Hereſie and Schiſm, might depoſe Princes, and exempt the Subjects from their Obedience*; the like was done by the *Univerſities* of *Caen, Rhemes, Poictoirs, Valence, Bourdeaux, Bourges*, and the Condemnation ſubſcrib'd by the *Jeſuits.* And *Mariana*'s Book was committed publickly to the flames by a *Provincial Council* of his own *Order*, for the diſcourſing the Point of *King-killing* Doctrine *problematically.* Why therefore ſhould this *diſloyal* Doctrine be laid to his *Church*, whenas it has been writ againſt by ſeveral hundred ſingle Authors in her *Communion*, and diſown'd, and ſolemnly condemn'd by ſo many famous *Univerſities*? And why ſhould the *Actions* of ſome *few Popes*, with the *Private Opinions* of ſome *Speculative Doctors*, be ſo often and vehemently urg'd for the juſt charging this Doctrine upon the Faith of the *Church of Rome*; which, to a Serious, Impartial Conſiderer, are only meer Fallacies, capable of Libelling all *Societies* in the World, of overthrowing all States and Kingdoms, and only fit Arguments for Knaves to cheat Fools withal. There being no Government in the World which might not be eaſily proved *Tyrannical*; No *Religion*, *Perſwaſion*, or *Society*, which might not plauſibly be indicted of *Atheiſm*; If the Actions, Pretences, Claims, and endeavour of ſome few of their *Governours* and *Leading Men*; the Opinions, Writings, Phanſies of ſome *Authors* be allow'd as *ſufficient Evidence*, for the bringing in the Verdict of *Guilty* upon the whole. When *Malice* therefore and *Envy* have done their worſt in this point, to render the *Papiſts* bloody and barbarous to the World; yet 'tis certain, after all, that *Popiſh Princes* ſit as ſafe in their Thrones, enjoy as much Peace and Security as any *other Princes* whatſoever; and that the *Papiſts* in *England* can give as good proofs of their Loyalty as the beſt of thoſe that clamour ſo loud againſt them. They can bid defiance to their Adverſaries to ſhew any one Perſon of Honour and Eſtate amongſt them, or even four of any condition whatſoever that bore Arms againſt *Charles* the Firſt, during the whole time of his Troubles. They can make good, that there was ſcarce any amongſt them that did not aſſiſt his *Majeſty* either with Perſon or Purſe, or both. And they can ſay, that *Charles* the Firſt was murder'd in cold blood by his *Proteſtant* Subjects, after many hundred *Papiſts* had loſt their Lives for the preventing that Butchery, and that

Charles

Charles the Second, being purſued by the *ſame Subjects* for his Life, ſav'd it amongſt the *Papiſts*.

XX. *Of the Depoſing Power.*

TO bring this matter into as narrow a compaſs as may be, I ſhalll firſt take notice of his Conceſſions, which will ſave us a labour of Proofs.

1. He yields *that the Depoſing and King-killing Power hath been maintained by ſome Canoniſts and Divines of his Church, and that it is in their opinion lawful, and annexed to the Papal Chair.*

2. *That ſome Popes have endeavoured to act according to this Power.*

But then he denies *that this Doctrine appertains to the Faith of his Church, and is to be believed by all of that Communion.* And more than that, he ſaith, *The affirming of it is a malicious Calumny, a downright Falſity.*

Let us now calmly debate the matter, Whether according to the received principles of the Church of *Rome*, this be only a particular opinion of ſome Popes and Divines, or be to be received as a matter of Faith. The Queſtion is not,

Whether thoſe who deny it, do account it an Article of Faith; for we know they do not: But whether upon the Principles of the Church of *Rome* they are not bound to do it.

I ſhall only, to avoid cavilling, proceed upon the Principles owned by our Author himſelf. *viz.*

1. *That the ſenſe of Scripture, as underſtood by the Community of Chriſtians in all Angels ſince the Apoſtles, is to be taken from the preſent Church.*

2. *That by the preſent Church he underſtands the Paſtors and Prelates aſſembled in Councils, who are appointed by Chriſt and his Apoſtles for the deciſion of controverſies; and that they have Infallible aſſiſtance.*

3. *That the Pope as Head of the Church, hath a particular aſſiſtance promiſed him, with a ſpecial regard to his Office and Function.*

If therefore it appear that Popes and Councils have declared this Depoſing Doctrine, and they have received other things as Articles of Faith upon the ſame Declarations, why ſhould they then ſtick at yielding this to be an Article of Faith, as well as the other.

It is not denied, that I can find, that Popes and Councils for ſe-

veral Ages have aſſerted and exerciſed the Depoſing Power; but it is alledged againſt theſe Decrees & Acts. 1. That they were not grounded upon Univerſal Tradition. 2. That they had not Univerſal Reception.

Now, if theſe be ſufficient to overthrow the Definitions of Councils, let us conſider the conſequences of it.

1. Then every Man is left to examin the Decrees of Councils, whether they are to be embraced or not; for he is to judge whether they are founded on Univerſal Tradition; and ſo he is not to take the ſenſe of the preſent Church for his Guide, but the Univerſal Church from Chriſts time: which overthrows a Fundamental Principle of the *Roman* Church.

2. Then he muſt reject the pretended Infallibility in the Guides of the Church, if they could ſo notoriouſly err in a matter of ſo great conſequence to the Peace of Chriſtendom, as this was; and conſequently their Authority could not be ſufficient to declare any Articles of Faith. And ſo all Perſons muſt be left at Liberty to believe as they ſee cauſe, notwithſtanding the Definitions made by Popes and Councils.

3. Then he muſt believe the Guides of the *Roman* Church to have been miſtaken, not once or twice, but to have perſiſted in it for Five hundred years; which muſt take away, not only Infallibility, but any kind of Reverence to the Authority of it. For whatever may be ſaid as to thoſe who have depended on Princes, or favour their Parties againſt the Guides of the Church, it cannot be denied that for ſo long time the leading Party in that Church did aſſert and maintain the Depoſing Power. And therefore *Leſſius* truly underſtood this matter, when he ſaid, *That there was ſcarce any Article of the Chriſtian Faith, the denial whereof was more dangerous to the Church, or did precipitate Men more into Hereſie and Hatred of the Church, than this of the Depoſing Power*; for, he ſays, *they could not maintain their Churches Authority without it.*

Diſcuſſio Decreti Magni Concil. Lateran. p. 89.

And he reckons up theſe ill Conſequences of denying it.

1. That the *Roman* Church hath erred for at leaſt five hundred years, in a matter fundamental as to Government, and of great Moment: Which is worſe than an Error about Sacraments, as Penance, Extream Unction, *&c.* and yet thoſe who deny the Church can err in one, hold that it hath erred in a greater matter.

2. That it hath not only erred, but voluntarily and out of Ambition, perverting, out of Deſign, the Doctrine of the Primive Church.

Church and Fathers concerning the Power of the Church, and bringing in another contrary to it, against the Right and Authority of Princes; which were a grievous sin.

3. That it made knowingly, unrighteous Decrees, to draw persons from their Allegiance to Princes; and so they became the Causes of many Seditions and Rebellions, and all the ill Consequences of them, under a shew of Piety and Religion.

4. That the Churches Decrees, Commands, Judgments, and Censures may be safely contemned as Null, and containing intolerable Errors. And that it may require such things which good Subjects are bound to disobey.

5. That *Gregory* VII. in the Canon *Nos Sanctorum, &c. Urban.* II. *Gregory* IX. the Councils of *Lateran* under *Alex.* III. and *Innocent* III, the Councils of *Lyons*, of *Vienna*, of *Constance*, of *Lateran* under *Leo* X. and of *Trent*, have all grievously and enormously erred about this matter; for that it was the Doctrine of them all, he shews at large; and so Seven General Councils lose their Infallibility at one blow.

6. That the Gates of Hell have prevailed against the Church: For the true Church could never teach such pernicious Doctrine as this must be, if it be not true. And if it erred in this, it might as well err in any other Doctrine, and so Men are not bound to believe or obey it.

7. That Princes and all Laymen have just Cause to withdraw from their Church; because it shewed it self to be governed by a spirit of Ambition, and not by the Spirit of God; and not only so, but they may justly prosecute all that maintain a Doctrine so pernicious to Government, if it be not true.

Let us now see what our Author saith to clear this from being a Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*.

1. *That for the few Authors that are abettors of this Doctrine, there are of his Communion three times the number that publickly disown all such Authority.*

If this be true, it is not much for the Reputation of their Church, That there should be such a number of those who are liable to all these dreadful Consequences, which *Lessius* urges upon the deniers of it: But is it possible to believe there should be so few followers of so many Popes, and Seven General Councils, owned for such by the disowners of this Doctrine, except the *Lateran* under *Leo* 10? The poor *Eastern* Christians are condemned for *Hereticks*

Discuss. Discuss. Part 3. Sect. 3. p. 1.

ticks by the Church of *Rome*, for refuſing to ſubmit to the Decrees of one General Council, either that of *Epheſus*, or of *Chalcedon*: And they plead for themſelves, That there was a miſinterpretation of their meaning, or not right underſtanding one another about the difference of *Nature* and *Perſon*, which occaſioned thoſe Decrees. I would fain know whether thoſe Churches which do not embrace the Decrees of thoſe Councils, are in a ſtate of Hereſie or not? If they be, then what muſt we think of ſuch who reject the Decrees of Seven General Councils, one after another, and give far leſs probable accounts of the Proceedings of thoſe Councils in their Definitions than the other do.

Philip. a SS. Trinit. Itiner. Orient. l. 5 c. 5. Clem. Galan. Concil. Eccl. Arm. Qu. 2. §S 3. p. 92.

2. He ſaith, *Thoſe who have condemned it, have not been in the leaſt ſuſpected of their Religion, or of denying any Article of Faith.* Let any one judg of this by *Leſſius* his Conſequences: And the Author of the firſt Treatiſe againſt the Oath of Allegiance ſaith in plain Terms, *That the Opinion that the Pope hath no ſuch Power, is erroneous in Faith, as well as temerarious and impious*; And he proves it by this ſubſtantial Argument; Becauſe they who hold it, muſt ſuppoſe that the Church hath been for ſome time in a damnable Error of Belief, and Sin of Practice: And he not only proves that it was defined by Popes and Councils, but for a long time univerſally received; and that no one Author can be produced before *Calvins* time, that denied this Power abſolutely, or in any caſe whatſoever. *But a few Authors that are Abettors of it*, ſaith our *Repreſenter*: *Not one total Diſſenter for a long time*, ſaith the other: And which of theſe is the true Repreſenter? *The deniers of it not in the leaſt ſuſpected of their Religion*, ſaith one: *Their Opinion is erroneous in Faith, temerarious and impious*, ſaith the other. And a Profeſſor of *Louvain*, now living, hath undertaken to ſhew that the number is far greater of thoſe who aſſert this Doctrine, than of thoſe who deny it.

Jeſuits Loyalty, firſt Treatiſe, p. 1. &c.

3. *If we charge their Church with this Opinion, may not they as well charge ours with the like; ſince Propoſitions as dangerous were condemned at* Oxford, July 26. 1683. *as held not by* Jeſuits, *but by ſome among our ſelves?* This is the force of his Reaſoning: But we muſt deſire the Reader to conſider the great diſparity of the Caſe. We cannot deny, that there have been men of ill Minds, and diſloyal Principles, Factious and Diſobedient Enemies to the Government both in Church and State; but have theſe Men ever had that Countenance from the Doctrines of the Guides of our Church

Auctoritas ſedis.

Apoſtolicæ vindicata adverſus Natal. Alexand. per Franciſc. D. Enghien. Colon. A.D. 1684.

Church, which the Depoſing Doctrine hath had in the Church of *Rome*? To make the Caſe parallel, he muſt ſuppoſe our Houſes of Convocation to have ſeveral times declared theſe Damnable Doctrines, and given Encouragement to Rebels to proceed againſt their Kings; and the Univerſity of *Oxford* to have condemned them; for this is truly the Caſe in the Church of *Rome*; the Popes and Councils have owned, and approved, and acted by the Depoſing Principle: but the Univerſities of *France*, of late years, have condemned it. How come the Principles of the Regicides among us to be parallel'd with this Doctrine, when the Principles of our Church are ſo directly contrary to them; and our Houſes of Convocation would as readily condemn any ſuch damnable Doctrines, as the Univerſity of *Oxford*? And all the World knows how repugnant ſuch Principles are to thoſe of the Church of *England*; and none can be Rebels to their Prince, but they muſt be falſe to our Church.

As to the Perſonal Loyalty of many Perſons in that Church, as I have no Reaſon to queſtion it, ſo it is not proper for me to debate it, if I did; ſince our buſineſs is not concerning Perſons but Doctrines; and it was of old obſerved concerning the *Epicureans*, That thô their Principles did overthrow any true Friendſhip, yet many of them made excellent Friends.

XXI. Of Communion in one kind.

HE *believes, that he is no longer oblig'd to obey* Chriſt's Commands *than his* Church *will give him leave. And that therefore tho' Chriſt inſtituted the* Sacrament *under* both kinds, *and commanded it to be receiv'd ſo by all; yet he thinks it is not neceſſary, for any to do ſo now, but* Prieſts; *becauſe his Church, forſooth, hath forbidden the Cup to the Laity; And put a ſtop to the Precept of Chriſt who ſaid,* Drink ye all of this, (*Mat.* 26.) *In ſubmiſſion to which Church-Prohibition, all the poor*

HE believes, that he is oblig'd to obey all the commands of Chriſt: and that neither his *Church* nor any other *Power* upon Earth can limit, alter, or annul any precept of *Divine Inſtitution*, contrary to the intention of the *Law giver.* Neither is the *Denial of the Cup to the Laity*, a practiſe any ways *oppoſite* to this his *Belief:* He being taught, that thô Chriſt inſtituted the *bleſſed Sacrament* under both kinds, and ſo deliver'd it to his *Apoſtles*, who only were then preſent, and whom he had made

people of his Communion contentedly rest, while they see themselves defrauded of great part of that benefit, which Christ left them, as his Last Will and Testament: for the comfort of their poor Souls, and the Remedy of their Infirmities.

made *Priests* just before; yet he gave *no command*, that it should be so receiv'd by all the *faithful*: But left this *indifferent*, as is evident from his own words, where he attributes the obtaining life everlasting (the end of the Institution) sometimes to the receiving under both kinds, sometimes under *one*: as when he says, *If any Man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever. He that eats Me, even he shall live by me. He that eats of this bread shall live for ever*, (John 6. v. 51, 57, 58.) And a *curious* Reader may find as many Texts for thus *Receiving* under *one kind*, as for the *other*. And St. *Augustine* was so far of this Opinion, that he says, that Christ himself administred the *Sacrament* to some of his Disciples, under *one kind* only, *viz.* to those two going to *Emaus*, (*Luk. c. last*, 30.) And that the Apostles afterwards did often practise the like, when they assembled, to *break bread*, (*Acts* 2. &c) Which places *He* and other *Fathers* explicate of the *Sacrament*, (*Aug. l.* 49. *de Cons. Evang*) And that this was the Custom of the *Primitive* Christians, to give it under *one* kind, to *Children*, to the *Sick*, and that Men on a *Journey* used so to carry it with them, is attested by all antient Writers, and modern Historians, Nay, he finds, that this was the practice of the *Church*, to Communicate under *one* kind only, or else under *both*, as every one thought good, especially in all *Private Communions*, for the first four hundred years after Christ: and that the first Precept of *Receiving under both kinds*, was given to the Faithful by *Pope Leo* I. in the year 443. and Confirm'd by *Pope Gelasius* in 490. not for the correcting any *Abuse*, that had crept into the *Church*, but for the discovering the *Manichees*, (who being of opinion, that Christ had no true Blood, and that *Wine* was the *Gall* of the Devil,) us'd to lurk among the *Christians*, and receiving under the form of *Bread only*, as the rest did, remain'd undistinguish'd, till by this Obligation of all Receiving the *Cup*, (which they judg'd unlawful and abominable) they were all detected. And, now, if a thing (till that time *Indifferent*,) was for these Motives determin'd by an *Ecclesiastical Precept*, and so observ'd for many hundred years, without scruple or questioning the *Authority*; why should he doubt to submit to the same *Authority*: when (upon different Motives and Circumstances,) they Issue forth another *Precept*. Few doubt of this in the matter of *Eating of strangled Meats and Blood*; which, tho forbid by the Apostles, (*Acts* 15.) and so unlawful, is now by another Order, and upon other circumstances, become a thing *Indifferent*, and like other things. And why then should he scruple in this, especially since there's no *Injury* done, nor he defrauded of any thing. For believing the *Real Presence* of Christ in the

Sacrament,

Sacrament, he conſequently believes *whole* and living *Jeſus* to be *entirely* contain'd under *either Species*: And that (receiving under *one* kind,) he is truly partaker of the *whole Sacrament*, and not depriv'd of either the *Body* or *Blood* of Chriſt.

XXI. *Of Communion in one kind.*

FOR our better proceeding in this Controverſie, I ſhall ſet down the State of it as clearly as I can.

1. The Queſtion is not, Whether the firſt Inſtitution of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt by Jeſus Chriſt, were in one kind, or two; for all confeſs it was under both kinds.

2. It is not, Whether both kinds are not ſtill neceſſary for the due Celebration of it; for it is granted that both kinds are neceſſary to be upon the Altar, or elſe there could be no compleat Sacrifice.

3. It is not, Whether the People may be wholly excluded from both kinds, and ſo the Sacrifice only remain: for they grant that the People are bound to communicate in one kind.

4. It is not concerning any peculiar and extraordinary Caſes, where no Wine is to be had, or there be a particular Averſion to it, or any ſuch thing, where poſitive Inſtitutions may be reaſonably preſumed to have no force: But concerning the publick and ſolemn Celebration, and participation of it in the Chriſtian Church.

5. It is not concerning the meer diſuſe or neglect of it, But concerning the lawfulneſs of Excluding the People from both Kinds, by the Churches Prohibition, notwithſtanding the Inſtitution of it by Chriſt in both kinds, with a Command to keep up the Celebration of it to his Second Coming.

Here now conſiſts the point in Controverſie, Whether the Church being obliged to keep up the Inſtitution in both kinds, be not equally obliged to diſtribute both as our Saviour did, to as many as partake of it? Our Author not denying the Inſtitution, or the continuance of it, ſaith, *Our Saviour left it indifferent to receive it in one kind, or both.* And that is the point to be examined.

1. He ſaith, *Chriſt delivered it to his Apoſtles, who only were then preſent, and whom he made Prieſts juſt before: yet he gave*

no command that it ſhould be ſo received by all the Faithful.

But were not the Apoſtles all the Faithful then preſent? I pray in what capacity did they then receive it? As Prieſts? How did they receive the Bread before the *hoc facite?* As Prieſts or as faithful? It is ridiculous to ſuppoſe the *hoc facite* changed their capacity; and if it did, it only relates to conſecrating, and not to receiving: but if Chriſt gave it only to the Apoſtles as Prieſts, then for all that I can ſee, the People are not at all concerned in one kind or other; but it was intended only for Prieſts: If the people be concerned, how came they to be ſo? Where is there any command but what refers to the firſt Inſtitution? And it had been more plauſible, according to this Anſwer, to exclude the People wholly, than to admit them to one kind, and to debar them the other.

2. *Chriſt attributes the obtaining Life Everlaſting, the end of the Inſtitution, ſometimes to receiving under both kinds, ſometimes under one,* John 6. 51, 57, 58. He could not eaſily have thought of any thing more againſt himſelf; for our Saviour there makes it as neceſſary to drink his Blood, as to eat his Fleſh, *Verily, verily,* 3. John 6. 51. *I ſay unto you, Except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you:* If this be underſtood of the Sacrament, as he ſaith, How is it poſſible for him to make the Cup indifferent? Unleſs it be indifferent whether the People be ſaved or not.

3. *Chriſt himſelf adminiſtred the Sacrament to ſome of his Diſciples under one kind only,* Luke 24. 30. But is he ſure Chriſt did then adminiſter the Sacrament to them? Or that if he did, the Cup was not implied, ſince breaking of Bread, when taken for an ordinary Meal in Scripture, doth not exclude drinking at it? *But S.* Auguſtin, he ſaith, (l. 49. *de Conſenſu Evangel.*) *underſtands that place of the Sacrament.* If he doth, it cannot be where he ſaith; for S. *Auguſtin* wrote but Four Books of that Subject: but l. 3. 25. he doth ſay ſomething towards it; yet S. *Auguſtin* in another place ſuppoſes that theſe Diſciples did both eat and drink. *The Diſciples did not know him, but in the breaking of* Tract. 2. in Epiſt. S. Joh. *Bread; and truly he that doth not eat and drink Judgment to himſelf, doth in the breaking of Bread own Chriſt.* Where it is plain, that he applies both, to the breaking of Bread here ſpoken of.

4. He ſaith, *it was the Cuſtom of the Primitive Chriſtians to give it under one kind to Children, the Sick, and to Men in a Journey.* I would he had produced his Authorities to prove theſe things; for I can bring ſeveral to prove the direct contrary as to Children, and ſick Perſons, and Travellers, and not only ancient Writers, but the moſt Learned of their own Church. And therefore I cannot but wonder to find him ſaying, *This was atteſted by all ancient Writers, and modern Hiſtorians.* But I have ever found thoſe have been moſt miſtaken, who produce *all Writers and Hiſtorians*; when it may be, there is not one that ſpeaks home to the buſineſs. At leaſt, we have here none mentioned, and therefore none to examine; and it would be too hard a task to ſearch *All.*

5. He adds to this extravagancy, in ſaying, *That Receiving in one or both kinds, was indifferent for the firſt four hundred years*; when the contrary is ſo manifeſt, that the moſt ingenious of their own Writers confeſs it. If any Perſons did carry home one kind (which is very queſtionable; for *Baronius* and *Albaſpinæus* ſay, they carried both kinds) to receive it in times of Perſecution, at what ſeaſon they thought fit afterwards; This ought not to be ſet up againſt the general and conſtant Rule of the Church; which is atteſted, not only by *Caſſander*, and ſuch like, but even by *Salmero*, *Ruardus Tapperus*, and *Lindanus*, who make no ſcruple of ſaying, the publick Celebration in the Primitive Church was in both kinds. But then, how is it poſſible for us to judge better, what they thought themſelves bound to do, than what they conſtantly obſerved in all their publick Celebrations? The Church is not accountable for the particular Fancies or Superſtitions of Men; but what was obſerved in all publick Offices, we have reaſon to think the Church thought it ſelf obliged ſo to do, out of regard to the Inſtitution of Chriſt. And to ſhew how Univerſal this Obſervation was in the Church, thoſe who give account of the *Eaſtern* Church ſay, That the *Greeks*, *Neſtorians*, *Armenians*, *Maronites*, *Cophtites* and *Abyſſins*, do all obſerve it ſtill, *viz.* That the publick Communicants do partake of both kinds. And not one of all theſe Churches, but think themſelves bound to obſerve it, out of regard to the Inſtitution of Chriſt; and why then ſhould any think the Primitive Church thought it indifferent?

Cotovic. Itiner. Hieroſolymit. l. 2. c. 6. Hiſtoir. Critique, p. 14.

6. *The first Precept of receiving under both kinds, was given to the Faithful by Pope* Leo, A. D. 443. *and confirmed by* Gelasius, A. D. 490. This is a great miſtake, for *Leo* gave no Precept about it; but only told the People how they might certainly diſcover the *Manichees*, for they would conform in other things, but they would not taſte of the Wine; which argued, that all other Communicants did then partake in both kinds. *Gelaſius* not only confirms the Cuſtom then uſed, but he ſaith, *That it is Sacriledge to divide that Holy Myſtery.* And ſurely he did not account Sacriledge an indifferent thing.

p. 52. 7. Laſtly he ſaith, *That thoſe who receive in one kind are truly Partakers of the whole Sacrament.* This is a new way of Concomitancy; we uſed to hear of *Whole Chriſt* under either Species, and that *Whole Chriſt* was therefore received; but how comes it to be *the whole Sacrament* which conſiſts of two diſtinct Parts? And if it be a Sacrifice, the Blood muſt be ſeparated from the Body, elſe the Blood of Chriſt is not conſidered as ſhed, and ſo the Notion of the Sacrifice will be loſt: Which is our next Head.

XXII. Of the MASS.

HE *believes an* inſufficiency *in the* Sacrifice *made by* Chriſt *upon the* Croſs: *and that his* Death *will little avail us in order to our Redemption, unleſs we, by daily* Sacrificing *him to his Father, perfect what he began: and therefore little taking notice of St.* Paul's *Words to the* Hebrews, (Chap. 10. 14.) *where he ſays, that Chriſt our High-Prieſt* by one Oblation, hath perfected for ever them that are ſanctified: *He thinks he ſhall never be ſanctified, but by the* Offering *made by his* Maſs Prieſt *upon their Altars, when they ſay* Maſs; *and thus*

HE believes that the *Sacrifice* made by Chriſt upon the *Croſs* was altogether *ſufficient*: That by it he Sav'd and Redeem'd us, paying the Debt of Sin, and ſatisfying the Infinite *Juſtice* of his Father: That by it he procur'd *means* for our Salvation; which *means* are *Faith* and *Good Works*, and moſt honourable to God is the *Offering a Sacrifice.* And as Chriſt's *Worſhipping* of God, Chriſt's *Faſting*, Chriſt's *Praying* and *ſuffering* for us, does not hinder or evacuate our *Worſhipping* of God, our *Faſting*, our *Suffering*, our *Praying*, for our ſelves.

wholly relying upon this Superſtition, (*an Invention of ſome crafty* Pope *for the deceiving* Widows *and* Credulous *Women,*) *he is taught to neglect the* Paſſion *of Chriſt and to put no hopes in his* Merits, *and the work of our* Redemption.

ſelves. So neither did his *Sacrifice* hinder or evacuate all *Sacrifices* for ever. But as he inſtituted Faſting, Praying, and ſuffering for his Followers, that by ſo doing they might apply what he did to themſelves; ſo alſo he inſtituted a *Sacrifice*; that by it they might apply the merits of *his Sacrifice*, and make it beneficial to their Souls. So that though he firmly believes, that Chriſt offered *Sacrifice* for our Redemption, and *by one only Offering*, (ſpoken of by St. *Paul*) perfected by way of *Redemption* the *Sanctification* of all thoſe that are ſanctified; yet he alſo believes, that to receive the benefit of this *Offering*, we muſt alſo do *our parts*, by our *Good Works* concurring with Chriſt, ſo becoming *Labourers together with God*, 1 Cor. 3. 9, and in ſome manner *purifying our own ſelves*, 1 John 3. 3. and therefore not omit the *beſt* of all Works, which is *Sacrifice*, proper to none but *God*: Which our Saviour *Jeſus Chriſt* inſtituted at his laſt Supper, when leaving unto us his *Body* and *Blood* under two diſtinct Species of *Bread* and *Wine*, he bequeath'd, as a *Legacy* to his Apoſtles, not only a *Sacrament*, but alſo a *Sacrifice*: A *Commemorative Sacrifice*, lively Repreſenting, in an *unbloody* manner, the *bloody Sacrifice* which was offered for us upon the *Croſs*; and by a diſtinction of the Symbols, diſtinctly *ſhewing his Death* (Chriſt's) *until he come*. This he gave in charge to his *Apoſtles*, as to the firſt and chief *Prieſts* of the *New Teſtament*, and to their Succeſſors to Offer; commanding them to do the ſame thing he had there done at his *laſt Supper*, in commemoration of him. And this is the *Oblation*, or *Sacrifice* of the *Maſs*, which has been obſerv'd, perform'd, frequented by the Faithful in all Ages, atteſted by the General Conſent of ancient *Canons*, univerſal *Tradition*, *Councils*, and the practice of the whole *Church*, mention'd and allow'd of by all the Fathers *Greek* and *Latin*; and never call'd into queſtion but of late Years; being that *pure Offering* which *Malachy*, (Prophecying of Chriſt) foretold ſhould *be offer'd among the Gentiles in every place*, Mal. 1. 11. as it is underſtood by ſeveral Fathers, and particularly, S. *Cypr.* l. 1. c. 18. *adverſ. Jud.* S. *Jerom*, S. *Theodoret.* S. *Cyril*, in their Commentaries upon this Text: S. *Auguſtine*, l. 18. c. 15. *de Civit.* S. *Chryſoſt. in Pſal.* 95. and others.

Of

Of the MASS.

UNder this Head, which is thought of ſo great conſequence in the *Roman* Church, I expected a fuller Repreſentation than I here find; as about the *Opus Operatum, i. e.* how far the meer Act is effectual: About their *Solitary Maſſes*, when no Perſon receives but the Prieſt; about the People having ſo little to do, or underſtand, in all the other parts of the *Maſs*; About the Rites and Ceremonies of the *Maß*, how uſeful and important they are; About reconciling the preſent Canon of the *Maß*, with the preſent Practiſes; About offering up *Maſſes* for the honour of Saints. All which we find in the Council of *Trent*, but are omitted by our *Repreſenter*; Who ſpeaks of the *Maß*, as tho there were no Controverſie about it, but only concerning the Sacrifice there ſuppoſed to be offered up, and which he is far from true Repreſenting: For the Council of *Trent* not only affirms *a true proper propitiatory Sacrifice to be there offered up for the quick and dead*, but denounces *Anathema*'s againſt thoſe that deny it. So that the Queſtion is not, Whether the Euchariſt may not in the ſenſe of Antiquity be allowed to be *a Commemorative Sacrifice*, as it takes in the whole Action; but whether in the *Maß* there be ſuch a Repreſentation made to God of Chriſt's Sacrifice, as to be it ſelf a true and propitiatory Sacrifice for the Sins of the Quick and the Dead?

Seſſ 22. cap 2. can 1, 2, 3, &c.

Now, all that our *Repreſenter* ſaith to the purpoſe, is,

p. 53. 1. *That Chriſt bequeathed his Body and Blood at his laſt Supper under the ſpecies of Bread and Wine, not only a Sacrament, but alſo a Sacrifice.* I had thought it had been more proper to have offered a Sacrifice, than to have bequeathed it. And this ought to have been proved as the Foundation of this Sacrifice, *viz.* That Chriſt did at his laſt Supper offer up his Body and Blood, as a Propitiatory Sacrifice to God. And then what need his ſuffering on the Croſs?

2. *He gave this in charge to his Apoſtles, as the firſt and chief Prieſts of the New-Teſtament, and to their Succeſſors, to offer.* But Where? When? and How? For we read nothing at all of it in Scripture. *Chriſt indeed did bid them do the ſame thing he had there done in his laſt Supper.* But did he then offer up himſelf

ſelf, or not? If not, How can the Sacrifice be drawn from his Action? If he did, it is impoſſible to prove the neceſſi y of his dying afterwards.

3. *This Sacrifice was never queſtioned till of late years.* We ſay, it was never determined to be a *Propitiatory Sacrifice*, till of late. We do not deny the Fathers interpreting *Mal.* 1. 11. of an Offering under the Goſpel; but they generally underſtand it of Spiritual and Euchariſtical Sacrifices; and although ſome of them, by way of Accommodation, do apply it to the Euchariſt, yet not one of them doth make it a *Propitiatory Sacrifice*, which was the thing to be proved: For, we have no mind to diſpute about Metaphorical Sacrifices, when the Council of *Trent* ſo poſitively decrees it to be a *True, Proper, and Propitiatory Sacrifice.*

XXIII. Of Purgatory.

HE *believes*, (*contrary to all* Reaſon,) *the* Word *of* God, *and all* Antiquity, *that* (*beſides* Heaven *and* Hell,) *there is a third place, which his* Church *is pleas'd to call* Purgatory; *a place intended purely for thoſe of his Communion, where they may eaſily have admittance after this Life, without danger of falling into* Hell; *for, that though* Hell *was deſigned firſt, for the puniſhment of Sinners; yet (that now, ſince the bleſſed diſcovery of* Purgatory,) Hell *may eaſily be skip'd over, and an eternal Damnation avoided, for an exchange of ſome* ſhort Penalty *undergone in this* Pope's Priſon; *where he never need fear to be detained long; for that, if he has but a friend left behind him, that will but ſay a few* Hail-Maries *for his Soul, or in his* Teſtament *did but remember to order*

HE believes it damnable to admit of any thing for *Faith* that is contrary to *Reaſon*, the *Word of God*, and all *Antiquity*; and that the Being of a *Third Place*, (call'd *Purgatory*,) is ſo far from being contrary to all, or any of theſe, that it is atteſted, confirm'd and eſtabliſh'd by them all. 'Tis expreſly in the 2*d. of the Maccabees*, c 12. where Money was ſent to *Hieruſalem*, that *Sacrifices* might be offered for the ſlain: And 'tis recommended as a *Holy Cogitation to Pray for the Dead.* Now though theſe *Books* are not thought Canonical by ſome, yet St. *Auguſtine* held them as *ſuch*, and ſays they are ſo received by the *Church*, (*l.* 18. *de Civit.*) But whether ſo, or no, one thing is allow'd by all, *viz.* That they contain nothing contrary to *Faith*, and that they

a ſmall ſum to be preſented to ſome Maſs Prieſt, *he never need doubt of being ſoon* releas'd; *for that a* Golden Key *will as infallibly open the Gates of* Purgatory *as of any other* Priſon *whatſoever.*

they were cited by the *Antient Fathers* for the Confutation of Errors, forming of good Manners, and the explication of the Chriſtian Doctrine: Thus were they us'd by *Origen* for Condemnation of the *Valentinian Hereticks*, (*Orig. in cap* 5. *Ep. ad Rom.*) thus by St. *Cyprian*, (*Lib. de Exhor. Mart. c.* 11.) thus by *Euſeb. Cæſarienſis.*) *Lib. Præpar. Evang.* 11. *c.* 15.) thus by St. *Greg. Naz. Ambroſ.* &c. And he is in a manner certain that the *Books* would never have been put to *this Uſe* by theſe Holy and Learned Fathers; they would never with ſuch confidence have produc'd their *Authority*, nor would they have been read by the *Church* in thoſe *Golden* times, had this Doctrine of a *Third Place*, (and of *Prayers for the Dead*, which they maintain,) been any *idle Superſtition*, a meer *Dream*, contrary to *Reaſon*, the *Word of God*, and *Antiquity*; or had it been any *Error* at all. The being alſo of a *Third Place* is plainly intimated by our *Saviour*, (*Matth.* 12. 32.) where he ſays, *Whoſoever ſpeaks againſt the Holy Ghoſt, it ſhall not be forgiven him, neither in this World, neither in the World to come.* By which words *Chriſt* evidently ſuppoſes, that (though theſe ſhall not) yet ſome ſins are forgiven in the *World to come*: which ſince it cannot be in *Heaven*, where no *ſin* enters; nor in *Hell*, whence there is no Redemption; it muſt neceſſarily be ſome *Middleſtate*: And in this ſenſe it was underſtood by St. *Auguſtine* nigh twelve hundred Years ago, as is manifeſt in his Works, (*Civ. Dei, l.* 21. *c.* 13, *&* 24. *& lib.* 6. *cont. Julian. c.* 15.) ſo alſo by St. *Gregory the Great*, (*l.* 4. *Dial. c.* 39.) ſo by St. *Bernard* againſt the Hereticks of his time. In the ſame manner does St. *Auguſtine* underſtand thoſe words of St. *Paul*, (1 *Cor.* 3. 15.) *He himſelf ſhall be ſaved; yet ſo as by fire.* Where he thinks him to ſpeak of a *purging fire*, (*Aug. in Pſal.* 37.) So the ſame *Father* underſtands that *Priſon* of which St. *Peter* ſpeaks, (1 *Pet.* 3. 19.) to be ſome place of *Temporal Chaſtiſement*, (*Aug. Ep.* 99.) And if this great *Doctor* of the Church in theſe purer times, found ſo often in the Bible, *a place of Pains after this Life*, from whence there was *Releaſe*; how can any one ſay, without great preſumption, that the Being of a *Third Place* is contrary to the *Word of God*? Neither can the *Antiquity* of this Doctrine be more juſtly call'd in queſtion, of which is found ſo early mention, not only by this Holy Father, but even by others his Predeceſſors, the Diſciples of the Apoſtles, and the beſt *Witneſſes* of their Doctrine, (*Dionyſ. l. de Eccl. Hier. c.* 7. *In Actis SS. Perpet. & Felicit.* mention'd and approv'd by S. *Aug. l.* 1. *de Anima & ejus Orig. c.* 10. *l.* 3. *c.* 9. *& l.* 4. *c.* 18. *Tertul. l. de Cor. Mil. c.* 3. *Cypr. Ep.* 66. *ad Cler. Arnob.*

Arnob. l. 4. *cont. Gent. pag. ult.*) and many others quoted at length by the Learned *Natalis Alixand. Tom.* 9. *Hiſt. Eccl. diſſert.* 41) And as for the *Reaſon* of this *Tenet*, he is bound to think it does not want it, ſince he finds it abetted by ſuch Virtuous, Learned and Conſidering Men, whom he dares not reckon *Fools*; never hearing, that theſe us'd to *Believe*, but upon very good Grounds and ſubſtantial Reaſons. And he thinks he is able to give ſome himſelf, by what he has learned from the *Scriptures*, and theſe *Fathers*. For having been taught by theſe; *Firſt*, That when a ſinner is reconci'd to God, though the *Eternal Puniſhment* due to his ſins, is always remitted, yet there ſometimes remains a *Temporal Penalty* to be undergone. As in the caſe of the *Iſraelites*, (*Num.* 14.) who by *Moſes*'s Prayers obtained Pardon for their *Murmuring*, and yet were excluded the *Land of Canaan*. As in the Caſe of *David*, (2 *Sam.* 12.) who was puniſh'd in the loſs of his *Child*, after his *ſin* was *forgiven*. *Secondly*, That there are ſome ſins, which of their own nature are *Light and Venial*, ſuch as *cool* the fervour of *Charity*, but do not *extinguiſh* it, from which even *Holy* Men are not exempt, and of which it is ſaid, that the *Juſt man falls ſeven times*, (*Auguſtin. Enchir. c.* 70. *& lib. Quæſt. Oct. tr.* 9. 26.) *Thirdly*, That to all ſins, whether great or ſmall, ſome *Penalty* is due to the *Juſtice* of God; who as he has *Mercy* to forgive, has alſo *Juſtice* to puniſh: ſo that as St. *Auguſtin* ſays, (in *Ennar. in Pſal.* 50.) *Whoſoever ſeeks to God for mercy, muſt remember that he is juſt, and that his ſin ſhall not paſs unpuniſhed*. *Fourthly*, That generally ſpeaking, few Men depart out of this life, but either with the guilt of ſome light offences and *venial ſins*, or elſe obnoxious to ſome *Temporal Puniſhment* due to former ſins forgiven. From theſe Heads, Diſcourſe leads him immediately to the *Neceſſity* of ſome *Third Place*. For ſince the *Infinite Goodneſs* of God can admit nothing into Heaven, which is not *clean*, and pure from all ſin both *great and ſmall*: And his *Infinite Juſtice* can permit none to receive the *Reward* of *Bliſs*, who as yet are not out of *debt*, but have ſomething in *Juſtice* to *ſuffer*: There muſt of neceſſity be ſome *Place or State*, where Souls, departing this life, pardon'd as to the *Eternal Guilt or Pain*, yet obnoxious to ſome *Temporal Penalty*, or with the guilt of ſome *venial faults*, are *Purg'd and Purify'd* before their Admittance into *Heaven*. And this is what he is taught concerning *Purgatory*. Which, though he knows not, *Where it is*; *of what nature the Pains are, or how long each Soul is detained there*? yet he believes, that thoſe, that are in this Place, being the *Living Members* of Jeſus Chriſt, are reliev'd by the *Prayers* of their Fellow-Members here on Earth; and that the *Charitable Works* perform'd upon their Death-bed, and the Alms diſpos'd on in their *Laſt Will*, are very available afterwards in order to their ſpeedier *releaſe*.

XXIII. *Of PURGATORY.*

HEre our Author begins with proving from Scripture and Antiquity, and then undertakes to explain the Doctrine of *Purgatory* from substantial Reasons.

1. As to his Proof from Scripture.

1. Is that from 2 *Maccab.* c. 12. where he saith, *Money was sent to* Jerusalem, *that Sacrifices might be offered for the slain; and 'tis recommended as a Holy Cogitation, to pray for the dead.*

To this, which is the main foundation of *Purgatory*, I answer, 1. It can never prove such a *Purgatory* as our Author asserts; for he supposes *a Sinner reconciled to God, as to eternal Punishment*, before he be capable of *Purgatory*; but here can be no such Supposition, for these Men died in the sin of *Achan*, which was not known till their Bodies were found among the slain. Here was no Confession, or any sign of Repentance; and therefore if it proves any thing, it is *deliverance from Eternal Punishment*, and for such as dye in their Sins without any shew of Repentance. 2. We must distinguish the Fact of *Judas* from the Interpretation of *Jason*, or his Epitomizer. The Fact of *Judas* was according to the strictness of the Law, which required in such Cases *a Sin-Offering*; and that is all which the *Greek* implies. Ἀπεστείλεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα προσαγαγεῖν περὶ ἁμαρτίας Θυσίαν. And so *Leo Allatius* confesses all the best *Greek* Copies agree; and he reckons Twelve of them. Now what doth this imply, but that *Judas* remembring the severe punishment of this Sin in the Case of *Achan*, upon the People, sent a Sin-Offering to *Jerusalem*? But saith *Leo Allatius, It was the sin of those men that were slain.* I grant it. But the Question is, Whether *the Sin-Offering* respected the dead or the living? For the Law in such a Case required *a Sin-Offering for the Congregation.* And why should not we believe so punctual a Man for the Law, as *Judas*, did strictly observe it in this point? *But the Author of the Book of* Maccabees *understands it of those that were slain.* I do not deny it; but then, 3. We have no Reason to rely upon his Authority in this matter; which I shall make appear by a parallel Instance. He doth undoubtedly commend the fact of *Razias* in *Killing himself* (2 Macc. 14. 42.) when he saith he did it, Εὐγενῶς, *like a brave Man*; and if he had thought it a fault in him, he would never have

Leo Allat. de Purgat. p. 889

Levit. 4. 13.

have given such a Character of it, but he would have added something of Caution after it. And it is no great advantage to *Purgatory*, for him that commends Self-murder to have introduced it. The most probable account I can give of it is, That the *Alexandrian Jews*, of whose number *Jason* of *Cyrene* seems to have been, had taken in several of the Philosophical Opinions, especially the *Platonists*, into their Religion, as appears by *Philo*; and *Bellarmine* himself confesses, that *Plato* held a *Purgatory*: and they were ready to apply what related to the Law, to their Platonick Notions. So here the Law appointed a Sin-offering with respect to the Living; but *Jason* would needs have this refer to the dead; and then sets down his own remark upon it, That *it was a holy Cogitation to pray for the dead*; as our Author renders it. If it were *holy* with respect to the Law, there must be some ground for it in the Law. And that we appeal to; and do not think any particular Fancies sufficient to introduce such a Novelty as this was, which had no Foundation either in the Law or the Prophets. And it would be strange for a new Doctrine to be set up, when the Spirit of Prophecy was ceased among them. *Bellar.* de Purgat. l. 1. c. 8.

But S. August. *held these Books for Canonical*, and saith, *they are so received by the Church, l.* 18. *de Civit. Dei.* To answer this it is sufficient to observe, not only the different Opinions of others before mentioned as to these Books; but that as *Canus* notes, *it was then lawful to doubt of their Authority:* and he goes as low as *Gregory* I. whom he denies not to have rejected them. And I hope we may set the Authority of one against the other; especially when S. *Augustine* himself, being pressed hard with the fact of *Razias*, confesses, 1. *That the Jews have not the Book of* Maccabees *in their Canon, as they have the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, to whom our Lord gave Testimony as to his Witnesses.* Which is an evident Proof, he thought not these Books sufficient to ground a Doctrine upon, which was not found in the other. 2. *That however this Book was not unprofitably received by the Church, if it be soberly read and heard.* Which implies a greater Caution than S. *Augustine* would ever have given, concerning a Book he believed truly Canonical. But saith *Bellarmine, his meaning is only to keep men from imitating the Example of Razias*; whereas that which they pressed St. *Augustine* with, was not meerly the Fact, but the *Character* that is given of it: *Sanctarum Scripturarum* Can. l. 2. c. 10. Sect. 4. Aug. cont. ad Epist. Gaudent l. 2 c. 23. De Purgat. l. 1. c. 3.

Auctoritate laudatus eſt Razias, are their very Words in S. *Auguſtine*. And therefore the Caution relates to the Books, and not merely to his Example. And he leſſens the Character given by the Author, when he ſaith, *He choſe to dye nobly*; *It had been better*, ſaith he, *to have died humbly. But the other is the Elogium given in the Heathen Hiſtories, and better becomes brave Heathens than true Martyrs.* Can any one now think S. *Auguſtine* believed this Writer Divinely inſpired, or his Doctrine ſufficient to ground a Point of Faith upon? And I wonder they ſhould not every jot as well commend *Self-murder* as an *Heroical Act*, as prove the Doctrine of *Purgatory* from theſe words of *Jaſon*, or his Epitomizer. For the Argument from the Authority of the Book, will hold as ſtrongly for one as the other. And yet this is the *Achilles* for *Purgatory*; which *Natalis Alexander* (whom our Author follows in this matter) ſaith, *is a demonſtrative place againſt thoſe that deny it.* But I muſt proceed.

Natal. Alex. Sec. 4 Diſſ. 4.

2. *Purgatory is plainly intimated by our Saviour*, Matt. 12. 32. *Whoſoever ſpeaketh againſt the Holy Ghoſt, it ſhall not be forgiven him, neither in this World, neither in the World to come. By which words, Chriſt evidently ſuppoſes, that ſome Sins are forgiven in the World to come.* I am ſo far from diſcerning this plain Intimation, that I wonder how any came to think of it out of this place. Well! *But doth it not hence follow, that Sins may be forgiven in the World to come?* Not near ſo plainly, as that Sins will not be forgiven in the World to come. *Not that particular Sin, but others may*; How doth that appear? What intimation is there that any Sins not forgiven here, ſhall be forgiven there? Or that any Sins here remitted as to the Eternal Puniſhment, ſhall be there remitted as to the Temporal? And without ſuch a kind of Remiſſion, nothing can be inferred from hence. *But if there be a Remiſſion in another World, it can be neither in Heaven nor Hell, therefore it muſt be in purgatory.* But thoſe who own a Remiſſion of Sins in another World, ſay it will be on the day of Judgment: For the actual Deliverance of the Juſt from Puniſhment, may be not improperly called the full Remiſſion of their Sins. So S. *Auguſtine*, whom he quotes, plainly ſaith, *Si nulla remitterentur in judicio illo noviſſimo, &c. Julian*, l. 6. c. 5. where it is evident S. *Auguſtine* takes this place to relate to the Day of Judgment; and ſo in the other, (*De Civit. Dei l.* 21. *c.* 24.) But as he ſup-

ſuppoſed a Remiſſion, ſo he did a Purgation as *by Fire* in that day. *In illo judicio pœnas quaſdam purgatorias futuras. De Civit. Dei l.* 20. *c.* 25. And ſo he is to be underſtood on *Pſal.* 37. to which he applies 1 *Cor.* 3. 15. But our Author was very much out, when he ſaith S. *Auguſtine* applied 1 *Pet.* 3. 15. to ſome place of temporal Chaſtiſement in another World, when *Bellarmine* ſets himſelf to confute S. *Auguſtine* about it, as underſtanding it of this World. And therefore he hath little cauſe to boaſt of St. *Auguſtine*'s Authority about *Purgatory*, unleſs he had brought ſomething more to the Purpoſe out of him. His other Teſtimonies of Antiquity are not worth conſidering; which he borrows from *Natalis Alexander*: that of *Dionyſius Areopag. Eccl. Hierarch.* c. 7. is a known Counterfeit, and impertinent, relating to a Region of Reſt and Happineſs. And ſo do *Tertullian's Oblations for the Dead*, *De Cor. Milit.* c. 3. For they were Euchariſtical, as appears by the ancient Liturgies, being made for the greateſt Saints. St. *Cyprian*, Ep. 66. ſpeaks of *an Oblation for the Dead*: and he there mentions the *Natalitia* of the Martyrs: but by comparing that with his *Epiſt.* 33. it will be found that he ſpeaks of the *Anniverſary Commemoration of the Dead*, which ſignifies nothing to Purgatory: for the beſt men were put into it: and St. *Cyprian* threatens it as a Puniſhment to be left out of the *Diptychs*; but ſurely it is none to eſcape Purgatory: *Arnobius l.* 4. only ſpeaks of *praying for the Dead*, which we deny not to have been then uſed in the Church, not with reſpect to any temporary pains in *purgatory*, but to the Day of Judgment: And therein lies the true ſtate of the Controverſie, with reſpect to Antiquity: which is not, Whether any ſolemn Prayers were not then made for the dead; but whether thoſe Prayers did relate to their deliverance out of a ſtate of Puniſhment before the Day of Judgment. For whatever ſtate Souls were then ſuppoſed to be in, before the great Day, if there could be no deliverance till the Day of Judgment, it ſignifies nothing to the preſent Queſtion.

Bell. de An. Chriſti l. 4. c. 13.

As to the Viſion of *Perpetua* concerning her Brother *Dinocrates* who died at Seven Years old, being baptized, it is hardly reconcilable to their own Doctrine, to ſuppoſe ſuch a Soul in Purgatory: I will not deny that *Perpetua* did think ſhe ſaw him in a worſe Condition: and thought likewiſe that by her Prayers ſhe brought him into a better; for ſhe ſaw him playing like little Children:

and

and then ſhe awaked, and concluded that ſhe had given him eaſe: but is it indeed come to this, that ſuch a Doctrine as Purgatory muſt be built on ſuch a Foundation as this? I do not call in queſtion the Acts of *Perpetua*, nor her ſincerity in relating her Dream: but muſt the Church build her Doctrines upon the Dreams or Viſions of young Ladies, tho very devout? for *Ubia Perpetua* was then but Twenty Two, as ſhe ſaith her ſelf. But none are to be blamed who make uſe of the beſt ſupports their Cauſe will afford.

It is time now to ſee what ſtrength of Reaſon he offers for *Purgatory*. 1. He ſaith, *When a Sinner is reconciled to God, tho the Eternal Puniſhment due to his Sins is always remitted, yet there ſometimes remains a temporal Penalty to be undergone*; *as in the caſe of the* Iſraelites *and* David. But doth it hence follow, that there is a Temporal Penalty that muſt be undergone either here or hereafter, without which there will be no need of *Purgatory?* Who denies, that God in this Life, for example ſake, may puniſh thoſe whoſe Sins he hath promiſed to remit as to another World? This is therefore a very ſlender Foundation. 2. *There are ſome ſins of their own nature light and venial.* I will not diſpute that; but ſuppoſe there be, muſt men go then into Purgatory for meer Venial Sins? What a ſtrange Doctrine doth this appear to any man's Reaſon? That God ſhould forgive the greater ſins, and require ſo ſevere a Puniſhment for ſins in their own nature venial; *i. e.* ſo inconſiderable in their own Opinion, that no man is bound to confeſs them; which do not interrupt a State of Grace; which require only an implicite deteſtation of them; which do not deſerve eternal Puniſhment; which may be remitted by Holy Water, or a Biſhop's Bleſſing, as their Divines agree. 3. *That to all Sins ſome penalty is due to the Juſtice of God.* And what follows from hence but the neceſſity of Chriſt's Satisfaction? But how doth it appear, that after the Expiation of Sin by Chriſt, and the remiſſion of eternal Puniſhment, there ſtill remains a neceſſity of farther ſatisfaction for ſuch a temporal penalty in another World? 4. *That generally ſpeaking, few men depart out of this Life, but either with the guilt of venial ſins, or obnoxious to ſome Temporal puniſhment.* No doubt, all men are obnoxious by their ſins to the puniſhment of another World; but that is not the point, but whether God hath declared, That altho he remits the eternal Puniſhment, he will not the temporal; and altho he will forgive thou-

ſands

3. Th part 3. q. 87 art 3. in cor. v. Marſil. Column. Hydragiolog *Sect.* 7. c. 3 n. 32. Sect. 3. c. 2. n 15 29 c 3. n. 1. Bell. de Cultu Sanct. l 3 c. 7. *Sect.* ſecundo.

ſands of pounds, he will not the pence and farthings we owe to him: But if Mortal ſins be remitted as to the guilt, and Veniel do not hinder a ſtate of Grace, what room is there for Vindictive Juſtice in *purgatory*?

Yet this is the Doctrine which ſo much weight is laid upon; that *Bellarmine* ſaith, *They muſt go directly to Hell who do not believe purgatory.* If this be true, why was it not put into the *Repreſentation*, that we might underſtand the danger of not believing ſo credible, ſo reaſonable a Doctrine as this? But we believe it to be a much more dangerous thing to condemn others for not believing a Doctrine which hath ſo very ſlender a pretence either to Scripture or Reaſon. De Purgatorio l. 1. c. 11. SS. Hæc ſunt.

XXIV. Of Praying in an Unknown Tongue.

HE is counſell'd by his Church, to be preſent at Sermons, *but never permitted to hear any he is able to* underſtand; *they being all deliver'd in an* unknown Tongue. *He is taught to* Pray, *but it muſt be in* Latin. *He is commanded to aſſiſt at the* Church Service, *and to hear* Maſs, *but it muſt be without underſtanding a word; it being all perform'd in a* Language *of which he is altogether* Ignorant. *And thus is miſerably depriv'd of all the comfortable Benefits of Chriſtianity:* Hearing, *but without* Underſtanding; Praying, *but without reaping Fruit; aſſiſting at Publick Aſſemblies, but like a* Stock *or a* Stone, *without feeling, or any the leaſt ſenſe of Devotion.*

HE is counſell'd by his Church to be preſent at *Sermons*, ſuch as he is able to underſtand, they being always deliver'd in the *Vulgar Language* of every Country: In *France, French*; in *Spain, Spaniſh*; in *Italy, Italian*: in *England* (if permitted) *Engliſh*: they being purely intended for the *good Inſtruction* of the Congregation preſent. He is taught to *pray*, and always provided of ſuch Books of Devotion as he is capable of underſtanding; every Nation being well furniſhed with ſuch helps, extant in the Language proper to the Country. He is commanded to aſſiſt at the Church-Service, and to hear *Maſs*; and in this he is inſtructed, not to underſtand the *Words*, but to know *what is done.* For, the *Maſs* being a *Sacrifice*, wherein is daily commemorated the *Death* and *Paſſion* of Chriſt by an *Oblation* made by the Prieſt, of the *Body* and *Blood* of the Immaculate *Lamb*, under the Symbols of Bread and Wine, according to his own *Inſtitution*:

tion: 'tis not the busines of the Congregation present, to imploy their *Ears* in attending to the *Words*, but their *Hearts* in contemplation of the *Divine Mysteries*, by raising up fervent affections of Love, Thanksgiving, Compassion, Hope, Sorrow for sins, Resolutions of amendment, *&c.* That thus having their Heart and Intention united with the Priests, they may be partakers of his *Prayers*, and of the *Sacrifice* he is then offering, than which he believes nothing is more acceptable to God, or beneficial to true Believers. And for the raising of these affections in his Soul, and filling his Heart with the extasies of Love and Devotion, he thinks in this case, there's little need of Words; a true *Faith*, without these, is all-sufficient. Who could but have burst forth into Tears of Love and Thanksgiving, if he had been present while our Saviour was tyed to *Pillar*, *Scourg'd* and *Tormented*, though he open'd not his mouth to the Bystanders, nor spake a word? who would have needed a *Sermon* to have been fill'd with *Grief* and *Compassion*, if he had seen his *Saviour* expos'd to the *scorn* of the *Jews*, when he was made a bloody spectacle by *Pilate*, with, *Ecce homo*, *Lo the Man*? Who could have stood cold and senseless, upon Mount *Calvary*, under the *Cross*, when his *Redeemer* was hanging on it, though he had heard, or not understood a word that he spoke? Does any one think that those *Holy Women*, who follow'd their *Lord*, in these sad Passages, and were Witnesses of his Sufferings, wanted Holy Affections in their Souls, because he spoke not: or were they scandaliz'd at his *silence*? Was not their *Faith* in him that suffer'd, by which they believ'd him to be *Christ Jesus*, true God and Man, laying down his life for the *Redemption* of Man, sufficient to excite in their Souls all the Passions due from a sinful Creature, to his bleeding Redeemer, to his Crucified *Jesus*? The like *Faith* also is sufficient to fill him with Devotion, when he is present at the Holy *Sacrifice* of the *Mass*: For believing, that Christ is there *really present* before him, under the Species of *Bread and Wine*, and that *He* that lies upon the Altar, is the *Lamb of God that takes away the sins of the World*; What need of more, to quicken in his Soul all the *Affections* of a *Devout Lover*? Can he behold his *Redeemer* before him, and not break forth into *Love* and *Thanksgiving*? Can he see him, that gives sight to the Blind, health to the Sick, and life to the Dead, and yet stand still senseless and un-mov'd, without putting any *Petition* to him, without asking any thing, for his *blind*, *sick and sinful Soul*? Can he believe that he that gives his life for the World, and died for our sins, is there before him, and not be touch'd with *sorrow* and *contrition* for his *Offence*? Can he see commemorated every *doleful passage* of his Saviour's *sufferings*, in the several *Mysteries* of the *Mass*, and yet not be fill'd with *grief* and *compassion*? Is not *Jesus* welcome to a devout Soul, although he come in *silence*? Is not the *Presence* of Christ, a more forcing motive to a *Christian*, than any *Humane*

Words

Words could be? And if he muſt needs have *Words*, let him behold with the eye of *Faith* the *gaping Wounds* of his *Redeemer*, and ſee if thoſe *ſpeak* nothing to his *Soul*? If they do not, 'tis becauſe he wants *Faith*. It nothing therefore concerns his *Devotion*, that the *Maſs* is ſaid in *Latin*: If the *Church* has order'd it thus, ſo to preſerve *Unity*; as in *Faith*, ſo in the *External Worſhip* of God, and to prevent *alterations* and *changes*, which it would be expos'd to, if in *Vulgar Languages*, and other good Reaſons; What's that to him? He ſhould receive but little advantage if it were in his *Mother Tongue*. For beſides, that the greateſt part is ſaid in ſo *low a Voice*, that it is not poſſible he ſhould hear it; the *Words* do not belong to him, That's only the Prieſt's *Office*; and the *Obligation* is, to accompany the Prieſt in *Prayer*, and *Spirit*, to be a *joint-Offerer* with him, to contemplate the *Myſteries* there repreſented, and to excite in his Soul Devotions according to the exigency of every Paſſage; according to the Directions he finds in his *Engliſh* Prayer-Books, of which there are extant great variety, ſet forth for the help of the *Ignorant*; by which they are taught the *meaning* of every Part and Ceremony of the *Maſs*, and how to apply their Devotions accordingly. And if at any time he be preſent at other *publick Devotions*, as the *Church Offices*, the *Litanies*, *ſolemn Thankſgivings*, *Exequies*, &c. which are all perform'd in *Latin*; or ſhould ſay any *private Prayers*, or ſing an *Hymn* in the ſame Language, which he underſtands not; yet is he taught that this may be done, with great *benefit* to his Soul, and the acceptance of God; if at theſe occaſions he does but endeavour to raiſe his thoughts to *Heaven*, and fix his Heart upon his Maker. For that God does not reſpect the *Language* of the *Lips*, but of the *Heart*, does not attend the motion of the *Tongue*, but of the *Mind*; and if *theſe* be but directed to him in *Thankſgiving*, in *Praiſing*, in *Petitioning*, in *Humiliation*, in *Contrition*, and ſuch like Acts, as Circumſtances require, he need not doubt but that God accepts his *Prayers* and *Devotions*: It being an undeniable thing, that, to ſay Prayers *well* and *devoutly*, 'tis not neceſſary to have attention on the *Words*, or on the *Senſe* of the Prayers; but rather purely on *God*: Of theſe three *Attentions*, this *laſt* being approv'd by all, as of greateſt Perfection, and moſt pleaſing to God. And this he can have, whether he underſtands the Words or no: it being very uſual and eaſie for a *Petitioner* to accompany his *Petition* with an earneſt deſire of obtaining his ſuit, tho the *Language* in which it is worded be *unknown* to him.

XXIV. *Of Praying in an unknown Tongue.*

THE Queſtion in ſhort is, Whether the Church Service, at which Perſons are bound to aſſiſt, ought not to be in a Language underſtood by thoſe who are bound to aſſiſt?

For our Author grants, *That a Papiſt is bound to aſſiſt at the Church Service, and to hear* Maſs; but he is not bound to underſtand the Words there ſpoken.

This is a plain ſtate of the caſe; and one would have thought St. *Paul*'s Diſcourſe about Edification in the Church-Service, and a known Tongue, and the Primitive Practice, had deſerved a little conſideration, but not a Word is ſaid to either of them; and the whole is ſo managed, as tho there had been no Rule, or any appearance of Practice to the contrary. But I muſt conſider what he doth ſay.

1. *The Maß is a Sacrifice:* And what then? Have they no other Church-Service but the *Maß?* What then becomes of their Breviaries, Litanies, and all other Offices? But ſuppoſe the Prieſts Office in the *Maß*, be to offer the Sacrifice; are there no Prayers in the Canon of the *Maß*, wherein the People are concerned? Why muſt not they underſtand what they are required to aſſiſt in *Prayer* for? If they have *Engliſh* Books, as he ſaith, to teach them every part and Ceremony of the *Maß*, why not as well the Prayers in the *Maſs*, wherein they are to joyn? They tell us, *It is unſeaſonable then for the People to ſay their Beads, and other Devotions*: And I ſuppoſe as unſeaſonable to talk, or think of other matters. Why then ſhould not they know what it is they are to do, and what Petitions they are then to make to God? Are there no Reſponſes to be made? No Leſſons to be read? No Creed to be profeſſed? Doth not the Prieſt ſpeak to the People to pray, and they anſwer him? Is there no Thankſgiving after the Communion which the People is concerned in? We are as much for *their Devout Affections* as they can be, but we think they are not hindred by underſtanding what they are about: We cannot but wonder, that any man ſhould ſay, *That it nothing concerns his Devotion that the* Maſs *is in* Latin, if he underſtand it not. Is it no part of Devotion to joyn in the publick Prayers, not merely by rote, but from a due apprehenſion of the matter contained in them? He requires, *That they accompany the Prieſt in Prayer and Spirit*: And why not in underſtanding alſo? *But the Church hath ſo ordered it:* And that is the thing we complain of, as done againſt St. *Paul*, againſt the Primitive Church, againſt the natural ſenſe of Mankind, who think it is fit for them to know what they do, eſpecially in the Wor-

ſhip

ſh'p of God: *But it is to preſerve Unity*: Methinks however Unity in Spirit and Underſtanding is better than without it: *There are other good Reaſons*: I know not one good one; and if there were more, he would have produced them: *The greateſt part is ſaid in a low Voice, that it is not poſſible he ſhould hear it*: And to what purpoſe ſhould it be ſpoken louder, if they are not to underſtand it? But why ſo low in publick? Yet the People might have Books, and joyn, if they underſtood what was ſaid. But why ſhould not the reſt be underſtood, which is ſpoken as if it were?

2. As to other Offices, he ſaith, *He is taught, that he may perform them in a Language which he underſtands not, with great benefit to his Soul, and the acceptance of God, if at thoſe occaſions he endeavours to raiſe his Thoughts to Heaven, and fix his Heart upon his Maker.* But the Queſtion is not, Whether a Man may not have devout Thoughts at that time, but whether he can perform his part in the publick Offices, with true Devotion, without Underſtanding? for the publick Offices of Devotion were deſigned for the uniting the Hearts and Deſires of the People in the ſame things. It is not, whether one Man may not pray for Heaven, and another for fair Weather, and another for pardon of his Sins, and a Fourth for Patience, and ſo on, in the ſame place, and at the ſame time; for all this may be done as well in a *ſilent Meeting*, where not a Word is ſpoken: But there being one Form of Prayer for all to joyn together in that with the united force of the whole Congregation, their Petitions may go up to Heaven; The matter now in diſpute is, Whether it be not neceſſary in order to this united Devotion, that the People all know what they pray for? And one would think nothing need to be ſaid to prove this: But what our Author adds in Juſtification of this, overthrows all publick Devotion; for he ſaith, *It is not neceſſary to have attention on the Words, or on the Senſe of Prayers, but rather purely on God*: Which is to make all publick Forms unneceſſary, and to turn all Devotion into *Prayer* of *Contemplation*: For if this be true, all Forms whatſoever are not only uſeleſs, but burthenſome; and by the ſtinting the Spirit, do hinder the nimbler flights of the Soul in pure ſilence towards God: And this Principle muſt lead men to *Enthuſiaſms*, and unintelligible Unions; and make them deſpiſe *Forms* as a mean and dull Diſpenſation.

But at last he saith, *A petitioner may accompany his petition with an earnest desire of obtaining it, though the Language in which it is written be unknown to him.* Very true, if he indited the matter of the Petition, and trusted another to put it into that Language, which the Person to whom he makes it doth understand, but not his own: But all Languages are alike to God's Infinite Wisdom, and so there can be no pretence on that account to keep only to some particular Tongues, tho unknown to the Party; and if it were so to all men, no man would have a Petition presented in a Language which he did not know: But in Prayer to God, the design of it is not to acquaint him with something which he knew not, but to excite the Hearts and Affections of men to an earnest desire of the things which are fit for them to ask: Now let any man undertake to prove, that mens affections are as easily moved by Words they do not understand, as by those they do, and I will give up this Cause.

XXV. Of the Second Commandment.

HE *is kept in* Ignorance *as to an* Essential *part of his* Duty *towards* God; *never being permitted to know the* Commandments, *but by* halves. *For in the Books deliver'd to him for his Instruction*, (*such are* Catechisms *and* Manuals) *the* Second Commandment *is wholly* left out; *And he by this means* Superstitious Worship, *and is taught to fall into all sorts of down right* Idolatry. *And then the* Commandments *he does learn, are in such* disorder *by a confusion of the two first into one, and a cutting the* last *into Two, by putting only three in the* first Table, *and seven in the second: That no reason can be able to justifie this mangling and chopping, in opposition to all* Authority *and* Antiquity.

HE is instructed in his *whole Duty* towards *God*, and most especially in the *Ten Commandments*. He is taught to understand them all and every one: that there's an Obligation of observing them, under pain of eternal Damnation; and that whosoever breaks any *one* of them, loses the Favour of God, and as certainly hazards the loss of his Soul, as if he broke them all. And tho in the short *Catechisms* and *Manuals*, in which the whole *Christian Doctrine* is deliver'd in the most compendious and easie method, in condescendence to weak Memories, and low Capacities; the *Second Commandment* (as 'tis reckon'd by some) be wholly omitted; yet it is to be seen at length

in

in other Catechiſms, and Doctrinal Books, to be met with every where in great plenty. And if any one ſhould chance not to ſee any of theſe, yet would he be out of all danger of falling into any *Superſtitious Worſhip* or *Idolatry*: for that having read his *Firſt Commandment, Thou ſhalt have no other Gods before me*; he is taught, that by this he is commanded to Serve, Love, Adore, and Worſhip one *only* True, Living, and Eternal God, and no more: That 'tis forbidden him to Worſhip any *Creature* for a *God*, or to give it the Honour due to God; and that whoſoever Worſhips any *Idols, Images, Pictures, or any graven thing* (whatſoever the Object be, whether in Heaven above, in the Earth beneath, or in the Waters under the Earth) for God, breaks the *Commandment*, by committing *Idolatry*, and ſtands guilty of an inexcuſable and moſt damnable ſin. Now having been taught, that this is the intent of the *firſt Precept* of the *Decalogue*, he thinks there can be but little danger of his becoming *Superſtitious* in his Worſhip, or an *Idolator* for want of the *Second*; there being nothing in this, but what he is fully and expreſly inſtructed in, by having learn'd the *Firſt*: it being rather an *Explication* of this, than any *New and diſtinct Precept*: And for this reaſon he finds them in his Books, put together as *One*, or rather as the *firſt Commandment*, with its *explication*; by which means it comes about, that there are only *Three* in the firſt *Table*, teaching him his *Duty* towards *God*; and *ſeven* in the *latter*, concerning his *Duty* to his *Neighbour*; which is the *Diviſion* aſſign'd by St. *Auguſtine*. And tho St. *Hierom* obſerves not this method, but divides them into *Four* and *Six*, yet there being no direction in *Scripture* concerning the *Number* of the *Commandments* to be aſſign'd to *each Table*; nor to let us know which is the *firſt*, which the *ſecond*, which the *third* Commandment, or which the *laſt*: He is taught, that 'tis but an *unneceſſary* trouble, to concern himſelf about the *Number* of them, or *Diviſion*, when-as his whole Buſineſs ought to be, the *Obſervance* of them in his Life and Converſation.

XXV. *Of the Second Commandment.*

THE Diſpute about this is not,

Whether the Second Commandment may be found in any of their Books, but by what Authority it comes to be left out in any; as he confeſſes it is *in their ſhort Catechiſms* and *Manuals*: But not only in theſe; for I have now before me the Reformed Office of the Bleſſed Virgin, Printed at *Salamanca*, *A. D.* 1588. publiſhed by Order of *Pius* V. where it is ſo left out: And ſo in the Engliſh Office at *Antwerp*, *A. D.* 1658. I wiſh he had told us in what publick Office of their Church it is to be found: But him-

himself pleads for the leaving it out, when he saith. *The People are in no danger of Superstition or Idolatry by it; since the First Commandment secures them from it; and there is nothing in this, but what is vertually contained in the First, and is rather an Explanation, than a new and distinct Precept.* But is this so plain and clear, that a Mans Conscience can never make any just and reasonable Doubt concerning it? There is a terrible sanction after it; and men had need go upon very good Grounds in a matter of such moment. Hath God himself any where declared this to be only an Explication of the First Commandment? Have the Prophets, or Christ and his Apostles ever done it? How then can any mans Conscience be safe in this matter? For it is not a trifling Controversie, whether it be a distinct Commandment, or an Explication of the First, but the Lawfulness or Unlawfulness of the Worship of Images depends very much upon it: For if it be only an Explication of the First, then unless *one takes Images to be Gods*, their Worship is lawful, and so the Heathens were excused in it, who were not such Ideots: But if it be a new and distinct Precept, then the Worshipping any Image or Similitude, becomes a grievous sin, and exposes men to the Wrath of God in that severe manner mentioned in the end of it: And it is a great confirmation that this is the true meaning of it, because all the Primitive Writers of the Christian Church, not only thought it a sin against this Commandment, but insisted upon the force of it against those Heathens who denied that they took their Images for Gods: And therefore this is a very insufficient Account of leaving out the *Second Commandment*.

XXVI. Of Mental Reservations.

HE *is taught to keep no Faith with any that are reputed* Hereticks *by his* Church; *and that whatsoever* Promises *he has made, thô never so positive and firm, with this sort of People, he may lawfully break, and cheat and cozen them without any scruple. And tho* HE is taught, to keep Faith with all sorts of People, of whatsoever *Judgment* or *Perswasion* they be, whether in Communion with his *Church*, or no; he is taught to stand to his Word, and observe his *Promise* given, or made to any whatsoever: and that

he muſt not do this by down-right Lying, *and telling Untruths, for that would be a ſin; yet he may make uſe of any indirect ways, ſuch are* Diſſimulation, Equivocations, *and* Mental Reſervations, *and by theſe means draw them into his ſnares; And this without fear of offending* God, *who is well pleas'd with theſe kind of pious Crafts, allows of theſe Holy Cheats,* that he cannot cheat or cozen, whether by *diſſembling, equivocations,* or *mental reſervations,* without defiance of his own Conſcience, and the violation of God's *Law.* This is the Inſtruction he receives from the *pulpit,* the *Confeſſionary,* and his Books of Direction. The holy *Francis Sales,* in his *Introduction to a Devout Life,* (*p.* 3. *c.* 30.) tells him plainly, *Let your Talk be courteous, frank, ſincere, plain and faithful, without double-dealing, ſubtilty or diſſembling:* This he is taught to obſerve and practiſe, and that without this 'tis not poſſible to pleaſe God. In the Catechiſm *ad Parochos,* compil'd by order of the Conncil of *Trent,* and recommended to all Pariſh Prieſts for the Inſtruction of the Faithful, he is taught, that by the *Eighth Commandment* he is forbidden all *Diſſimulation,* whether in Word or Deed; that *cum ſcelere conjuncta ſunt,* to *ſpeak* or *do* otherwiſe than for the intimation of what is in the mind, is abominable and wicked. That no man ſhall bear *falſe witneſs* againſt his Neighbour, whether he be *Friend* or *Enemy.* And Pope *Innocent* XI, in a Decree iſſued forth the Second of *March, Anno* 1679. has ſtrictly commanded all the Faithful in virtue of his holy Obedience, and under pain of incurring the Divine Vengeance, that they never ſwear *equivocally,* or with any *mental reſervation,* upon no account or pretended convenience whatſoever; And that if any preſume either publickly or privately to teach or maintain the Doctrine of Swearing with *equivocations* or *mental reſervation,* that they *de facto* incur Excommunication *latæ Sententiæ,* and cannot be abſolv'd by any but the Pope himſelf, excepting at the hour of death. He is taught therefore to ſpeak plainly and ſincerely, without *Diſſimulations, Equivocations, mental Reſervations,* or any ſuch like *Artifices,* which cannot be but very injurious to all *Society,* and diſpleaſing to the *Firſt Truth.* And now if any *Authors* in Communion with his *Church,* be produced as Patrons of inward Reſerves, and grand Abettors of theſe mental *Juggles,* let them hold up their hands, and anſwer for themſelves: Their Church has declar'd for no ſuch Doctrine, and is no more to be charg'd with their extravagant *Opinions,* than with the unexemplar lives of other her *Members,* whoſe *Irregularities* are not at all deriv'd from their *Religion,* but from the neglect of their own corrupt Inclinations, and giving way to the temptations of their Enemy.

XXVI.

XXVI. *Of Mental Reſervations.*

UNder this Head he denies Two Things.

1. *That they are ever taught to break Faith with Hereticks.*

2. *That their Church doth allow any Equivocations, or Mental Reſervations.*

As to the former, I am ſincerely glad to find a Principle ſo deſtructive to all humane Society, ſo utterly diſowned, when he ſaith, *He is taught to keep Faith with all ſorts of People, of whatſoever Judgment or Perſwaſion they be; and to ſtand to his Word, and obſerve his Promiſe given, or made to any whatſoever.* And whatever Opinions and Practices there may have been of that kind formerly, we hope there will never be occaſion given to revive that diſpute.

2. As to the Second, We embrace his Declaration againſt it, and hope there is no Equivocation, or Mental Reſervation in it. But there are ſome things which muſt here be taken notice of.

1. He cannot deny that there are Authors in Communion with his Church, which may be charged with teaching another Doctrine; and thoſe not a few, nor inconſiderable; who not only allow the Practice of Mental Reſervations and Equivocations, but ſay with great confidence, it hath been received in the *Roman* Church for no leſs than Four hundred Years; and that in ſome Caſes they are all ſtill agreed in it. See *Parſons* Treatiſe of *Mitigation, c. 7. Sect. 2. 3. c. 10 Sect. 1.*

2. We do not deny, that *Innocent* XI. hath condemned Equivocations and Mental Reſervations in Swearing, as *at leaſt ſcandalous and pernicious in Practiſe*; and therefore we cannot charge the Pope with abetting this Doctrine. But we cannot but reflect on what our Author ſaid about the Depoſing Doctrine, *That altho Popes had believed it, and acted by it, yet the greater number oppoſed it.* And what ſhall we ſay in this Caſe; if the Generality of their Caſuiſts in ſome Caſes approve it, and think it no *Lye* or *Perjury*, as in that of *Confeſſion*; but if it be really ſo in any one Caſe, then it may be ſome other fault; but it is not a *Lye* or *Perjury* in any other, when a Man doth not think himſelf bound to ſpeak all he knows.

3. That as we highly commend the Pope's condemning ſuch Doctrines and Practiſes now; ſo we have Reaſon to think the con-

contrary did not once want the encouragement and approbation of the *Roman See:* as may be found in the reſolution of ſome Caſes by *Pius* V. relating to ſome *Miſſionaries*, who were to be ſent hither; and then it was declared, That if they were ſummon'd before our Judges, they might *Sophiſtice Jurare & Sophiſtice Reſpondere*; and that they were not bound to anſwer according to the Intention of the Judges, but according to ſome true ſenſe of their own, *i. e.* which was made true by the help of a Mental Reſervation. But it is very well, that now the very ſame things are condemned at *Rome*, as *Scandalous and Pernicious in Practiſe.*

Apud G. Abbot de Mendacio, &c. in Præf. p. 6. &c.

XXVII. Of a Death-Bed Repentance.

HE *is bred up in a total neglect of the ſervice of God, of all Virtue and Devotion, while he is well, and in good health, upon preſumption of a* Death-bed Repentance, *and a confidence, that all his ſins will be certainly forgiven, if he can but once ſay,* Lord have mercy upon me, *at the* laſt hour *And 'tis a ſufficient Encouragement to him, to rely wholly upon this, to ſee that there is no ſuch* profligate Villain, *none that has liv'd, tho to the height of Wickedneſs and debauchery of his* Communion; *but at his Death he ſhall be aſſiſted by a* Prieſt, *and ſhall receive an* Abſolution *from all his Sins, with an abſolute Promiſe of being ſoon admitted to* Bliſs, *and reigning with Chriſt, if he can but once ſay, he is* ſorry; *or if his Voice fail him, ſignifie as much by a* Nod *of* his *Head, or the* Motion *of a Finger.*

HE is bred up in the Service and Love of God, taught to work his Salvation in *fear* and *trembling* to provide in health time againſt the *laſt hour*, and by no means to rely upon a *Death-bed-Repentance*; for that Men, (generally ſpeaking,) as they live, ſo they dye; and 'tis to be fear'd greatly, that thoſe who neglect God Almighty, and forſake him all their *life-time*, will never find him at their death: So that (with St. *Auguſtine*) he doubts the Salvation of as many as defer their Converſion till that Hour, and has no encouragement at all to do it. However, if any are found that have been ſo neglectful of their Duty, as to put off this great buſineſs of *Eternity* to the *laſt moment*; he is taught, that, in Charity, they ought to have all *aſſiſtance* poſſible, to put them in mind of their condition, to excite them to a hearty deteſtation of all their Offences: To let them know, that, tho they deſerve Hell-fire in Puniſhment of their Wickedneſs, yet that they ought by no means *deſpair*,

for that God is merciful; and, who knows, but if they heartily call upon him, and endeavour for a ſincere Repentance, with an humble confidence on the *Merits* and *Paſſion* of *Jeſus Chriſt*, he may hear their Prayers, ſhew them mercy, and give them time to repent. Theſe are all the Promiſes can be given in this point; and this is what he ſees daily practis'd; and if ſome, by theſe means, are preſerv'd from falling into deſpair, 'tis well; but as for any receiving from hence, encouragement of coming into the *like circumſtances*, he thinks there's but little danger, eſpecially ſince there's nothing ſo often repeated in Books, no more common Subjects for Sermons, than the diſp'aying the manifold perils of *delaying* ones *Converſion*, and putting off *Repentance* till the *laſt hour*.

XXVII. *Of a Death-bed Repentance.*

WE have no difference with them about this matter, as far as they hold to theſe points: 1. *That men are ſtrictly obliged to work out their Salvation with fear and trembling in time of health*: 2. *That it is very dangerous to defer their Repentance to the laſt.* 3. *That if any are ſurpriſed, they ought in Charity to have all poſſible aſſiſtance, to put them into the beſt way for their Salvation.*

But yet there may be ſome particular Doctrines owned in the Church of *Rome*, which may give men too much encouragement to put off true Repentance; as 1. The eaſineſs of being put into a ſtate of Grace by the Sacrament of Penance; for which no more is required *than removing the Impediment*; as appears by the Council of *Trent*, *Seſſ.* 7. *Can.* 6. and afterwards it defines, *That bare Attrition doth ſufficiently diſpoſe a Man to receive Grace in that Sacrament*, *Seſſ.* 14. *c.* 4. So that altho a man hath led a very bad Life, if he hath but this *Attrition* for his Sins when he doth confeſs them, he is put into a ſtate of Grace by this Sacrament. And what can any Man expect more, and what can he do leſs! I do not mean a bare *natural Attrition*, the ſufficiency whereof is condemned by *Innocent* XI. in the ſame Propoſitions, (Fifty ſeventh) but that which the Council of *Trent* calls *Imperfect Contrition*, *i. e.* a good Motion in a man's Mind to forſake his Sins for fear of Puniſhment: If really no more be required for a ſtate of Grace but this, it is no wonder if Men put off the doing of that which may be done at any time ſo eaſily by the help of a Prieſt.

2. The Treaſure of the Church is another thing which is very apt to hinder mens ſpeedy Repentance; for by that they believe there

there is a ſtock ready of ſo many Merits and Satisfactions of others, if duely applied to them by Indulgences, that they need not be at ſuch pains *to work out their own Salvation with fear and trembling*. When a Man by the Sacrament of Penance is put into a ſtate of Grace, the Eternal Puniſhment is diſcharged, and nothing remains but ſome Temporal Pains: and to eaſe him of theſe he hath many helps, but eſpecially the Treaſure of the Church, which the Pope hath the diſpenſing of, as he is bound to believe: and by Indulgences he may eaſily get off ſome Thouſands of years of Purgatory-Pains; and if theſe ſhould fail him, there is another help yet left, which is leaving a ſtock of Prayers for his Soul when he dies; *which*, even our Author aſſures him, *are very available towards his ſpeedier releaſe out of Purgatory.*

XXVIII. Of Faſting,

HE *is contented with the appearance of Devotion, and looking not beyond the name of* Mortification, *he ſits down well ſatisfied with the* ſhadow, *without ever taking care for the* ſubſtance. *And this, being a great Pretender to* Faſting *and the* Denial *of* himſelf, *he thinks he has ſufficiently complied with his Duty in this point, and made good his claim, if he has but abſtain'd from* Fleſh; *and tho at the ſame time, he regales himſelf at Noon with all variety of the* choiceſt Fiſh *and ſtuffs himſelf at Night with the beſt* Conſerves *and delicateſt* Junkets, *and drinks all day the pleaſanteſt* Wines, *and other* Liquors; *yet he perſwades himſelf, that he is a truly* Mortified Man, *that he has moſt Chriſtian-like commemorated the* bitter Death *and* Paſſion *of his* Redeemer, *and done a work of great force, in order to the* ſup-

HIS Church teaches him, that the *Appearance* of Devotion, the Name of *Mortification*, and pretence to it, are only vain and fruitleſs things, if they are not accompanied with the *ſubſtance*; and that 'tis but a very lame compliance with the Eccleſiaſtical Precept of *Faſting*, to abſtain from *Fleſh*, unleſs all other *Exceſſes* are at the ſame time carefully avoided. 'Tis true, his *Church* has not forbidden on theſe days the *drinking of Wine*, but permits a moderate uſe of it, as at other times; but is ſo far from giving liberty to any of her *Flock* of committing *Exceſſes*, that ſhe declares *Drunkenneſs* and all *Gluttony* whatſoever, to be more *hainous* and *ſcandalous* ſins on *ſuch days* than on any other, they being expreſly contrary, not only to the *Law of God*, but alſo to the intention of the *Church*, which appoints

preſſing *his corrupt Inclinations, and* ſatisfying *for the* Offences *of his Life paſt. Nay, he has ſuch a prepoſterous conceit of things, that he believes it a greater ſin to eat the leaſt bit of* Fleſh *on a* Faſting-day *than to be down-right* Drunk, *or commit any other* Exceſs; *as having leſs ſcruple of breaking the* Commandments *of* God, *than of violating any* Ordinance *of the* Pope, *or any* Law *of his* Church. theſe times for the retrenching Debaucheries and conquering our vicious Appetites. And now if any of his *Profeſſion* make leſs ſcruple of being *Drunk* on a *Faſting-day* than of eating the leaſt *bit of Fleſh*, he knows nothing more can be ſaid of them, than of many others, who will not break the *Sabbath-day* by doing any *ſervile Labour* on it, for all the World, looking on this as a moſt *damning ſin*; and yet at the ſame time have little ſcruple of *Swearing, Curſing, Lying*, or *Revelling* the greateſt part of the day. Which is not becauſe they have more liberty for theſe than the former, they being all moſt wicked Offences; but becauſe they that do thus, are but Chriſtians by *halves*, who with a kind of *Phariſaical* and *Partial Obedience*, ſeem to bear ſome of the *Commandments* moſt zealouſly in their *Hearts*, while others they trample under their *feet*; ſcrupling many times at a *Moat*, and on other occaſions paſſing by a *Beam* undiſcern'd: for which, their *Church* is not to be accountable, but They themſelves; as being guilty of a wilful blindneſs, and a moſt unchriſtian Negligence. This is the real caſe of ſuch of his *Communion*, who, on days of *Humiliation*, while they abſtain from *Fleſh*, yet give ſcandal by their *Intemperateneſs*. They have a Command of God, by which they are oblig'd on *all days* to live *ſoberly*, and to avoid all *Gluttony* and *Drunkenneſs*; and on *Faſting-days*: beſides this Command of God, they have a *Church-precept*, by which they are bound (if able) to eat but *one Meal* in a day, and that *not of Fleſh*. And now if ſome are ſo inconſiderate and careleſs, as to be ſcrupulouſly obſervant of one of theſe Commands, and wholly negligent of the *other*; 'tis not becauſe their *Religion* teaches them to do ſo, (which deteſts and condemns all ſuch *ſcandalous Partiality*, and complying with their Duty by *halves*) but becauſe they ſhut their ears to all good Inſtruction, and chuſe rather to follow their own corrupt Appetites, than the wholſome Doctrine of their *Church*.

XXVIII. *Of Faſting.*

THE Queſtion here is, Whether a Man doth not obſerve their Churches Command about Faſting, who forbears all forbidden things, but takes liberty in thoſe which are not forbidden?

It

It is not, Whether they may not break the Commands of God, againſt *Gluttony* and *Drunkenneſs*; but whether they break the Law of the Church about Faſting? And notwithſtanding what our Author hath ſaid, I ſee no Reaſon for the Affirmative. I do not deny, 1. That it is a very indifferent ſort of Faſting, *to abſtain from Fleſh, unleſs all other ſorts of Exceſſes at the ſame time be carefully avoided.* 2. *That Exceſſes on ſuch days are more ſcandalous, becauſe there is a pretence of Faſting.* 3. *That God's Command doth at all times forbid Intemperance.* Which are the chief things he inſiſts upon. But yet this doth not reach the point, which is about their *Churches Command.* For their Caſuiſts diſtinguiſh Faſting into 1. *Natural*: which is total Abſtinence: and this is required only in order to receiving the Euchariſt. 2. *Moral*: which is the ſame with Temperance, or Faſting for Health. 3. *Eccleſiaſtical*: which is defined by them to be, *An Abſtinence from Food forbidden by the Church.* And if this Definition be true, it cannot be broken but by eating what the Church hath prohibited.

And therefore their Caſuiſts, as far as I can find, are agreed in theſe things;

1. That a Man may eat a full Meal of what is not forbidden, and not break the Churches Precept of Faſting, provided Veſpers be firſt ſaid. And the later Caſuiſts blame *Covarruvias* for making any ſcruple about it. *If a Mans Exceſs comes to be a mortal Sin, yet for all that,* ſaith *Reginaldus, He ſhall not be judged as a breaker of his Faſt.* Nay, *Leſſius* goes further, and ſaith, *He doth not loſe the Merit of Faſting. Quamvis aliquis multum excedat non ſolvit Jejunium,* ſaith *Card. Tolet.* And *Paulus Zacchias* ſaith, *This is the common Opinion*; and he thinks the *Intention* of the *Church is ſufficiently anſwered.* And ſo doth *Paſqualigus* in his *Praxis* of Faſting.

Reginald, Praxis. l. 4 c. 14. n. 163. Leſſ. de Juſtit. l. 4 c. 2. Dub. 2. n. 10. Inſtruct. Sacerd. l. 6. c. 2. n. 4. P. Zacch. Qu. Medico legales l. 5. tit. 1. Qu. 1 p. 29, 30, 31

2. A Man may drink Wine, or other drink, as often as he pleaſeth, without breaking his Faſt. He may *toties quoties bibere,* ſaith *Diana. Zach. Paſqualigus*, who hath written moſt fully on this Subject, ſhews, *That it is the general Opinion, that no quantity of Wine or other drink, tho taken without any neceſſity, is a violation of the Precept of Faſting; no, not although the Wine be taken for nouriſhment, becauſe the Church doth not forbid it; but this laſt,* he ſaith, *is not the general, but the more probable Opinion*

Paſqual. Deciſ. 120. n. 5. Dian. Sam. v. Jejun. n. 7. Zach. Paſqualigi. Praxis Jejunii Eccleſ. Deciſ 116. n. 3. Dec. 117. 1, 2 3.

3. A Man may eat ſomething when he drinks, to prevent its doing him hurt; beſides his good Meal, he may take what quantity

quantity he pleaſes of Sweet-meats or Fruit; he may have a good Refection at Night, and yet not break this ſtrict Precept of Faſting; *For the eating as often as one drinks, it is the common Opinion,* ſaith the ſame Caſuiſt (who was no *Jeſuit*) *That it is not forbidden, becauſe it is taken by way of a Medicine*; and he quotes a great number of their *Caſuiſts* for it. *A Collation at evening is allowed,* ſaith he. And *Leſſius* ſaith, *There is no certain Rule for the Quantity of it.* And *Card. Tolet* ſaith, *very large ones are allowed at* Rome *by the Pope's Connivence*; *even in the Court of* Rome, ſaith *Reginaldus.* And now I leave the Reader to judge of the ſeverity of Faſting required in the Church of *Rome.*

Deciſ. 119. n. 2. Deciſ. 86. n. 34. Leſſ. ubi ſupr. n. 11. Tolet ubi ſup. Regin. ubi ſup. n. 185.

XXIX. Of Diviſions and Schiſms in the Church.

HE *is of a Religion in which there are as many* Schiſms *as* Families: *And they are ſo divided in their* Opinions, *that commonly, as many as meet in company, ſo many ſeveral Tenets are maintain'd. Hence ariſe their infinite and endleſs* Diſputes; *and the diſagreement of their* Divines, *who pretend to give a true and ſolid explication of the* Myſteries *of the Chriſtian* Faith, *and yet differ in as many* Points *as they write of. Beſides, what variety of Judgments are there in their* Religious Houſes *and* Cloiſters, *none agreeing with another in their* Foundation, Inſtitution, *and* Profeſſion? *This being of the* Religion *of St.* Dominick, *That of St.* Francis, *a third of St.* Bernard, *Others of St.* Benedict; *and ſo without number*; *ſo that as many* Orders, *as many* Religions. *And yet they pretend to* Chriſtian Unity, *amidſt this* diverſity *growing upon them every day.*

HE is of a Religion in which there are no *Schiſms* or *Separations*; all the *Members* of it (however ſpread through the World) agreeing like *one man,* in every *Article* of their *Faith,* by an equal *ſubmiſſion* to the Determinations of their *Church.* And no one of them, tho' moſt Learned and Wiſe, ever following any other *Rule* in their *Faith* beſides this, *of aſſenting to all that the Church of God, planted by* Chriſt, *aſſiſted and protected by the* Holy Ghoſt, *propoſed to the Faithful to be believ'd, as the Doctrine of the Apoſtles, and receiv'd as ſuch in all Ages.* Which is, all unanimouſly to *believe as the Church of God believes.* No one of his *Communion* ever doubting of this, or ſcrupling to receive any thing after his *Churches Declaration.* And now, tho they all thus conſpire in every *point of Faith*; yet there is great *diverſity* among *School men* in their *Divinity-points* and

Opini-

Opinions of ſuch matters as are no *Articles* of *Faith*, and have no relation to it, but as ſome *circumſtance* or *manner*; which being never *defin'd* by their Church, may be maintain'd ſeverally, either *this* or *that* way, without any breach of *Faith*, or injury to their *Religion*: And of theſe things only they diſpute, and have their Debates in manner of a *School-Exerciſes*, without any diſagreement at all in their *Belief*, but with a perfect *Unity*. The like *Unity* is there amongſt their *Religious Orders*, all which ſay the ſame *Creed*, own the ſame *Authority* in the *Church* of *Chriſt*; and in every thing profeſs the ſame *Faith*; and have no other differences, than as it were of ſo many ſeveral ſteps or degrees in the practice of a Devout and Holy Life; ſome being of a more *ſevere* and *ſtrict* Diſcipline, others of a more *gentle* and *moderate*: ſome ſpending more time in *Praying*, others more in *Watching*, others more in *Faſting*; ſome being intended for the *Cateshiſing* and breeding up of Youth, others for taking care of *Hoſpitals*, and looking after the *Sick*; others for going amongſt *Infidels*, and Preaching to them the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt*, and for ſuch-like Pious and Chriſtian Deſigns, to the greater Glory and Honour of God: which differences make no other difference in the ſeveral Profeſſors, than there was between *Mary* and *Martha*, who expreſs'd their Love and Service to their *Lord* in a very different Imploy; but both commendably, and without any danger of prejudicing the *Unity* of their *Faith*.

XXIX. *Of Diviſions and Schiſms in the Church.*

TWO things he ſaith upon this Head:

1. *That they are all agreed in matters of Faith.*

2. *That they only differ in ſome School Points*; from whence he infers, That they have no Schiſms or Separations among them.

But that this is no juſt conſequence, will appear by the Schiſms and Separations among us, made by ſuch who profeſs to agree in all matters of Faith. Yet let us ſee how he proves that they agree in all matters of Faith; *becauſe they agree to ſubmit equally to the Determinations of the Church.*

Now this very way evidently proves that they do not all agree, becauſe they do not equally ſubmit to the Churches Determinations. For,

1. Some ſay they are bound to ſubmit to the Churches Determinations, as it repreſents the Univerſal Church; Others ſay no; but as the Churches Power is virtually lodged in the Guides of it. Now this is a very material Difference: for if it be on the former Account,

Account, then not the Popes and Councils Declarations are to be regarded, but as they expreſs the ſenſe of the Univerſal Church; and ſo the Majority of Votes, the Numbers in the Repreſentative and Diffuſive Church is chiefly to be regarded. And on this Ground ſome reject the Depoſing Power, tho plainly decreed by Popes and Councils. but they unhinge their Churches Authority by it. Now how is it poſſible for them to agree about matters of Faith, who differ fundamentally about the way how any things come to be matters of Faith? If they be decreed by Popes and Councils ſay ſome; and ſo the Depoſing Power is become an Article of Faith. No ſuch matter, ſay others, for a greater Number in the diffuſive Church oppoſe it, as in the *Gallican* Church, and elſewhere. Very well! But how then can theſe Parties be ſaid to agree in matters of Faith, and an equal Submiſſion to the Determinations of the Church?

2. Some again ſay, That it is not the conſent of the preſent Church can make any Article of Faith, but there muſt be an Univerſal Tradition from the Apoſtles times. And ſo they tell us the Depoſing Power can never be an Article of Faith, becauſe it wants the Conſent of all the Ages before *Gregory* VII. So that upon this Ground there can be no Article of Faith which cannot be proved to be thus delivered down to us. Others again ſay, this is in effect to give up their Cauſe, knowing the impoſſibility of proving particular Points in this manner: and therefore they ſay, the preſent Church is wholly to be truſted for the ſenſe of the foregoing.

Now theſe differences are ſtill on foot in their Church; and from theſe do ariſe daily diſputes about matters of Faith, and the Seat of Infallibility, whether in the Guides, or the Body of the Church: if the former, whether in the Church Repreſentative, or Virtual? Whether the Perſonal Infallibility of the Pope be a matter of Faith or not? Our Author ſaith, Not; others ſay, Yes: and yet he ſaith, *they are agreed in matters of Faith.* So that by his own Confeſſion they differ about other things than mere School-Points.

But ſuppoſe they were *agreed in Articles of Faith*, can there be no Schiſms or Diviſions in their Church? What thinks he of all the Schiſms between Popes and Popes? Of all the Schiſms between the Popes and the Emperors Parties? Which were as notorious, and ſcandalous, and miſchievous, as ever were in the World. What thinks he of the Schiſms between the Biſhops and the Regular Orders,

Orders, which were as croſs and peeviſh towards the Biſhops and Secular Clergy, as our Diſſenters themſelves? And among the Regular Orders, what Heats and Contentions have been, *Not about the practice of a devout Life*, I aſſure him, but about matters of Doctrine; and which both Parties ſeverally plead to be matters of Faith? As in the noted Controverſies of this laſt Age, about the Immaculate Conception of the Bleſſed Virgin, the power of Grace, and the Pope's Perſonal Infallibility: and they cannot ſay they are as yet agreed about theſe things.

XXX. Of Fryars and Nuns.

HE *is taught to have a high eſteem for all thoſe of his Communion, who cloiſtering themſelves up, become* Fryars *and* Nuns; *a ſort of People who call themſelves* Religious, *and are nothing but a* Religious Cheat: *under the cloak of Piety, and pretence to Devotion, deceiving the World, and living to the height of Wickedneſs, under the notion of* Saints. *They vow* Chaſtity, Poverty, *and* Obedience, *and obſerve nothing leſs; but live in all reſpects ſo irregular and ſcandalous, that were there to be taken a compendious draught of all the Luxury, Pride, Covetouſneſs, Irreligion, and other Vices, through the whole World, it might be modell'd according to what is acted between any of theſe four* Walls, *in which theſe* Recluſes *live, without danger of omitting any thing that is wicked and unchriſtian.*

HE is taught to have a high eſteem for thoſe of his Communion who undertake that ſort of Life, which according to Chriſt's own direction, and his Apoſtles, is pointed out as the *beſt*. A ſort of People, who endeavour to perform all that God has *commanded*, and alſo what he has *counſell'd* as the *better*, and in order to more *perfection*. They hear Chriſt declaring the danger of *Riches*; they therefore embrace a *voluntary Poverty*, and lay aſide all Titles to Wealth and Poſſeſſions. Saint *Paul* Preaches, That *he that giveth not his Virgin in Marriage doth better than he that does*; *and that ſhe that is unmarried cares for the things of the Lord, how ſhe may be holy both in body and Spirit*: They therefore chuſe a *ſingle ſtate*, conſecrating their *Virginity* to God; that ſo they may be wholly intent on his Service, and be *careful how to pleaſe him*; while ſhe that is married *cares for the things of the World, how ſhe may pleaſe her Husband*, 1 Cor. 7. 32, 33, 34, 38. The Goſpel proclaims, That thoſe that will *follow Chriſt, muſt deny themſelves*; they

therefore renounce their *own Wills*, and without reſpect to their own proper Inclinations, paſs their Life in a *perpetual Obedience*. And becauſe the World is corrupt, ſo that to a pious Soul every buſineſs is a *Diſtraction*, every diverſion a *Temptation*, and more frequently the provocations to *Evil*, than examples to *Good*; they therefore retire from it as much as poſſible, and confining themſelves to a little Corner or Cell, apply themſelves wholly to Devotion, making *Prayer* their buſineſs, the *Service* of *God* their whole Employ, and the *Salvation* of their *Soul?* their only deſign. And now, if in theſe *Retirements*, where every thing is order'd as it may be moſt advantageous for the promoting *Virtue* and *Devotion*, nothing permitted that is likely to prove a diſturbance to Godlineſs, or allurements to Evil, yet ſome live *ſcandalouſly*, and give *ill example* to the World: What can be ſaid, but, That no *State* can ſecure any Man; and that no ſuch Proviſion can be made in order to a *Holy Life*, but it may be *abus'd?* But yet he does not think that ſuch *Abuſes*, and the Viciouſneſs of ſome, can be Argument enough to any juſt and reaſonable man, to condemn the *whole*, and the *Inſtitution* it ſelf. Is not *Marriage* abus'd an infinite number of ways, and many forc'd to embrace this State, or at leaſt to accept of ſuch particular Perſons contrary to their own choice and liking? Is there any ſtate in this World, any Condition, Trade, Calling, Profeſſion, Degree, or Dignity whatſoever, which is not abus'd by ſome? Are *Churches* exempt from abuſes? Are not *Bibles* and the *Word* of *God* abus'd? Is not *Chriſtianity* it ſelf abus'd, and even the *Mercy* of *God* abus'd? If therefore there is nothing ſo Sacred and Divine in the whole World, which wicked and malicious Men do not pervert to their ill deſigns, to the high diſhonour of God, and their own Damnation; how can any one, upon the mere conſideration of ſome abuſes, paſs Sentence of Condemnation againſt a thing which otherwiſe is *Good* and *Holy?* 'Tis an undeniable Truth, that to embrace a Life exempt, as much as can be, from the turmoils of the World; and in a quiet Retirement to dedicate ones ſelf to the *Service of God*, and ſpend ones days in *Prayer* and *Contemplation*, is a moſt commendable Undertaking, and very becoming a *Chriſtian*. And yet, if ſome, who enter ſuch a courſe of Life as this, fall ſhort of what they pretend, and inſtead of becoming eminent in Virtue and Godlineſs, by their unexemplar lives prove a *Scandal* to their *Profeſſion*; Is their *Rule* and *Inſtitution* to be condemned; or rather, they who ſwerv'd from it? No, let not the Dignity of an Apoſtle ſuffer for the Fall of *Judas*; nor the *Commandments* lie under an Aſperſion upon the account of thoſe that break them.

XXX. *of*

XXX. *Of Friars and Nuns.*

OUR Diſpute is not, about the lawfulneſs of retiring from the World by ſuch Perſons who are rendred unfit for doing Service in it; and the more they ſpend their time in Devotion and Contemplation, ſo much the better.

But it lies in theſe Things,

1. Whether the Perfection of a Chriſtian State of Life lies in being cloyſtered up from the World, or labouring to do good in it? For this was the great ſnare made uſe of, to draw men into it, becauſe they repreſented this as the moſt perfect ſtate; whereas according to the Doctrine and Example of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, the active Life of doing good, is far beyond it.

2. Whether, although ſuch a Retirement be allowed, it be a thing pleaſing to God, to tye ſuch Perſons up by indiſpenſable Vows, whatever their Circumſtances may be, not to alter that State of Life; who either in Youth, or through Force, Paſſion, or Diſcontent, have entred into it? And this may be ſo much rather queſtioned, becauſe thoſe who aſſert the Pope may diſpenſe, go upon this ground, Becauſe Circumſtances may alter the Obligation of a Vow; and when a greater good is to be attained it ceaſeth to oblige; which to my Apprehenſion doth not prove the Pope's Power to diſpenſe, but the diſpenſable Nature of the Vows themſelves.

3. Whether all things of this nature being liable in continuance of time to great Degeneracy and Corruptions; and the numbers of ſuch Places being unſerviceable either to Church or State, it be not in the Power of the King and States of the Kingdom, to diſſolve and reduce them to ways more ſuitable to the Conveniences of both?

As to what he diſcourſes about *Councils of Perfection, the Diſtractions of the World, the Corruptions of the beſt Things,* &c. they reach not the main Points, but are only general Topicks, which we are not concerned to debate.

XXXI. Of Wicked Principles and Practices.

HE *is Member of a* Church *which is called* Holy; *but in her* Doctrine *and* Practices *ſo* Foul *and* Abominable, *that whoſoever admires her for* Sanctity, *may upon the ſame grounds do homage to Vice it ſelf. Has ever any Society ſince Chriſt's time, appear'd in the World ſo black and deform'd with helliſh Crimes as ſhe? Has not ſhe out-done even the moſt Barbarous Nations and Infidels, with her Impieties, and drawn a ſcandal upon the name of* Chriſtian, *by her unparallel'd Vices? Take but a view of the horrid Practices ſhe has been engag'd in of late years; conſider the* French *and* Iriſh *Maſſacres, the Murders of* Henry III. *and* IV. *Kings of* France, *the* Holy League, *the* Gun-powder Treaſon, *the* Cruelty *of Queen* Mary, *the* Firing *of* London, *the* late Plot *in the Year* 1678. *to ſubvert the* Government, *and deſtroy His* Majeſty; *the Death of Sir* Edmundbury Godfrey; *and an infinite number of other ſuch-like Deviliſh Contrivances; And then tell me whether that* Church, *which has been the Author and Promoter of ſuch barbarous deſigns, ought to be eſteem'd* Holy, *and reſpected for Piety and Religion, or rather be condemn'd for the* Myſteries *of* Iniquity, *the* Whore *of* Babylon, *which hath polluted the Earth with her Wickedneſs, and taught nothing but the Doctrine of Devils? And let*

HE is Member of a *Church*, which, according to the ninth Article of the *Apoſtles Creed*, he believes to be *Holy*; and this not only in *Name*, but alſo in *Doctrine*; and for witneſs of her Sanctity, he appeals to her *Councils, Catechiſms, Pulpits*, and *Spiritual Books* of Direction; in which the main deſign is, to imprint in the Hearts of the Faithful, this comprehenſive *Maxim* of Chriſtianity; *That they ought to love God above all things, with their whole Heart and Soul, and their Neighbour as themſelves.* And that none flatter themſelves with a confidence to be ſav'd by *Faith alone*, without living *Soberly, Juſtly*, and *Piouſly*; as 'tis in the Council of *Trent, Seſſ. 6. c.* 11. So that he doubts not at all, but that as many as live according to the *Direction* of his *Church*, and in obſervance of her *Doctrine*, live *Holily* in the Service of, and Fear of God, and with an humble confidence in the *Merits* and *Paſſion* of their *Redeemer*, may hope to be receiv'd after this Life into Eternal Bliſs. But that *all* in Communion with his *Church* do not live thus *Holily*, and in the fear of God, he knows 'tis too too evident; there being many in all places wholly forgetful of their Duty, giving themſelves up to all ſorts of Vice, and guilty of moſt

never ſo many Pretences be made, yet 'tis evident that all theſe Execrable Practices have been done according to the known Principles of this Holy Church, *and that her greateſt Patrons, the moſt Learned of her* Divines, *her moſt Eminent* Biſhops, *her* Prelates, Cardinals, *and even the* Popes *themſelves, have been the chief Managers of theſe Helliſh Contrivances. And what more convincing Argument that they are all well approved & conform to the* Religion *taught by their* Church.

moſt horrid Crimes. And though he is not bound to believe all to be *Truth* that is charg'd upon them by *Adverſaries*; there being no *Narrative* of any ſuch Deviliſh Contrivances and Practices laid to them, wherein *paſſion* and *Fury* have not made great *Additions*; wherein things *Dubious* are not improv'd into *Certainties*, *Suſpicions* into *Realities*, *Fears* and *Jealouſies* into *Subſtantial Plots*, and *downright Lies* and *Recorded Perjuries* into *Pulpit*, nay *Goſpel-Truths*. Yet really thinks, that there has been Men of his *Profeſſion* of every rank and degree, Learned and Unlearned, High and Low, Secular and Eccleſiaſtick, that have been ſcandalous in their Lives, wicked in their Deſigns, without the fear of God in their Hearts, or care of their own Salvation. But what then? Is the whole *Church* to be condemn'd for the vicious Lives of ſome of her *Profeſſors*, and her *Doctrine* to ſtand guilty of as many Villanies as thoſe commit who neglect to follow it? If ſo, let the Men of that *Society*, *Judgment*, or *Perſwaſion*, who are not in the like circumſtance, *fling the firſt ſtone*. Certainly if this way of paſſing Sentence be once allow'd as juſt and reaſonable, there never was, nor ever will be, any *Religion* or *Church* of God upon the Earth. 'Tis but reck'ning up the Idolatries, Superſtitions, Cruelties, Rebellions, Murders of Princes, Impieties, and other ſuch like Enormities, committed by the *Jews*, as they ſtand recorded in *Scripture*; and 'tis immediately prov'd that the *Jews* were never the *choſen People* of God, nor their *Law* the Dictates of Heaven. 'Tis but making a Liſt of the *Miſdemeanours, Irregularities, Abuſes, Exceſſes, Treacheries, Simony, Separation, Diſcords, Erroneous Doctrines*, to be found, even in the time of the Apoſtles and their Followers, and they are all effectually prov'd to be the Diſciples of *Antichriſt*, and that the World's *Redeemer* had no ſooner aſcended into Heaven, but his Apoſtles left him, and began to ſet up for Schiſm and Vice. By this way, *Conſtantine* may be evidently condemn'd for an *Heathen*, becauſe he murdered his Wife and his Son. And the *Religion* of *Theodoſius* be mark'd out for *Atheiſm*, becauſe, by his Order, ſeven Thouſand *Theſſalonians* were treacherouſly Maſſacred in three hours ſpace, without diſtinction of Sex or Age, or the Innocent from the Guilty. A *confident* Undertaker would find no difficulty in proving all this; eſpecially if he had but the *Gift* of *exaggerating* ſome things.

miſ-

misrepresenting others of finding *Authorities* and *Texts* for every idle Story, or charging the extravagant Opinions of every *single Author* upon the *Religion* they profess, of raking together all the Wickedness, Cruelties, Treacheries, Plots, Conspiracies, at any time committed, by any ambitious Desperado's, or wicked Villains: And then positively asserting, that what these did was according to the *Doctrine* of that *Church* of which they were Members; and that the true measures of the *Sanctity* and *Goodness* of the *Church* in whose Communion these Men were, may be justly taken from the Behaviour of such *Offenders*. But certainly no Man of Reason and Conscience can allow of such Proceedings. No sober Man would ever go to *Tyburn*, and *Whetstones-Park*, to know what is the Religion professed in *England* according to *Law*; Nor would look into all the Sinks, Jakes, Dung-hills, Common-shores about Town, from such a Prospect to give a true Description of the City. Why therefore should the Character of the *Church* of *Rome* and her *Doctrine* be taken only from the loose Behaviour and wicked Crimes of such, who thô in Communion with her, yet live not according to her Direction? She teaches Holiness of Life, Mercy to the Poor, Loyalty and Obedience to Princes, and the necessity of keeping the *Commandments* (witness the many Books of Devotion and Direction, made *English* for Publick benefit, written originally by *Papists*,) and great numbers there are (God be prais'd) who practice this in their Lives. And now if there be many also, who stop their Ears to good Instruction, and following the Suggestion of their own ungovern'd appetites, of Pride, Ambition, Covetousness, Luxury, *&c.* so lay aside all concern of Salvation, and become unchristian both to God and their Neighbour, that they are a shame to their *Profession*: Why should the *Church* be represented according to the *Wickedness* of those that neglect her *Doctrine*; and not rather by the Piety and Exemplar Lives of such as follow it? Is not this to deal by her, (if we may use such a Comparison) as 'tis generally done by the Sign of St. *Dunstan*, near *Temple-Bar*, (on which, thô the *Saint* be drawn almost in the *full proportion*, and there's no more of the *Devil* on it, besides the *reaching* towards him with a pair of *Tongs*;) yet 'tis describ'd only by the name of the *Devil-Tavern*, without the least mention of the *Saint*? And is not this *partiallity* unjust, and these *piece-meal* Descriptions unreasonable? Let the *Character* of the *Church* be given according to what she teaches, and not according to the *Writings* of every *positive Opiniator*, and the *Practices* of every wicked Liver, and then there's no fear of its coming out so *ugly* and *deform'd*. Neither let any one pretend to demonstrate the *Faith* and *Principles* of the *Papists*, by the Works of every *Divine* in that *Communion*; or by the *Actions* of every *Bishop*, *Cardinal*, or *Pope*; For they extend not their *Faith* beyond the *Declarations* of *General-Councils*: And standing fast to these, they yet own, that many

of

of their *Writers* are too looſe in their *Opinions*, that all *Biſhops* and *Cardinals* are not ſo edifying as becomes their State; and that *Popes* may have their failings too. A *Pope* is a Temporal Prince, keeps a Court, has variety of Officers about him. And if he has *Flatterers*, and *Miſ informers* too, 'tis nothing but what all Princes are ſenſible of, but cannot remedy. And hence he doubts not, but 'tis poſſible he may be engag'd in unlawful undertakings, and invite others to the like. And are not all other Princes ſubject to this too? But what then? Theſe Actions of *Popes* concern not the *Faith* of thoſe who are in Communion with them; they may throw a ſcandal indeed upon the *Religion*, but they can never alter its *Creed*. But what need any other return to the numerous Clamours made daily againſt the *wickedneſs* of the *Papiſts*? 'Tis a ſufficient vindication of their Chief *Paſtors* and *Popes*, (to uſe the words of a Perſon of Quality) that among two hundred and fifty, that have now Succeſſively bore that Charge, there are not above ten or twelve, againſt whom their moſt malicious Adverſaries can find occaſion of ſpitting their Venom; and that a Challenge may be made to the whole World, to ſhew but the fifth part of ſo many *Succeſſive Governors*, ſince the Creation, of which there have not been far more that have *abus'd* their *Power*. And as for their *Flock* and People owning this *Authority*, 'tis true, many wicked things have been done by ſome of them; and too many. like Libertines, neglect the care of their Souls: But however the *Generallity* of them live like *Chriſtians*; few come to them, but with their *Religion* they change alſo their *Manners* for the *better*; Few deſert them, but ſuch who ſeem to be fall'n out with all *Chriſtianity*; And whoſoever will look into any of our Neighbouring *Popiſh* Towns, as *Paris*, *Antwerp*, *Gaunt*, *&c.* will find in any *one* of them, more *Praying*, more *Faſting*, more *receiving the Sacraments*, more *viſiting of Priſoners and the Sick*, more *Alms-giving*, than in any ten Towns of the *Reformation*.

XXXI. *Of Wicked Principles and Practices.*

THE *Miſrepreſenter* charges the Church of *Rome* with many horrid Practices, as the *French* and *Iriſh* Maſſacres, the Murders of Two Kings of *France*, the Holy League, the Gun-powder-Treaſon, *&c.* And charges theſe as being done according to the Principles of that Church.

But in Anſwer to this he ſaith, 1. In General, *That the Doctrine of it is holy, teaching the Love of God and our Neighbour, and that none can be ſaved by Faith alone.* In which Doctrine we heartily concur with them. 2. *That altho many uncertain things paſs for certain, and falſe for true, yet he cannot deny that all ranks and de-*

degrees of men have been corrupted among them, being ſcandalous in their Lives, wicked in their Deſigns, without the Fear of God in their Hearts, or care of their own Salvation. This is a general Acknowledgment, but no particular Anſwer to the things objected. 3. *That the whole Church is not to be charged for the ſake of ſuch villanies.* Very true, unleſs ſome Doctrine owned in that Church gave encouragement to them: As ſuppoſe any ſhould ever have fallen into Rebellion upon the belief of the Depoſing Power; is not that Doctrine chargeable with the Conſequences of it? They are extremely to blame who charge a Church with what her Members do in direct Oppoſition to her Doctrine; but it is quite another Caſe, when the main Ground they alledge for their Actions is ſome allowed Principle in it. 4. *They are not accountable for the Actions of every Biſhop, Cardinal, or Pope; for they extend not their Faith beyond the Declaration of General Councils.* But ſuppoſe General Councils have declared ſuch Doctrines, and Popes act but according to them; is not their Church then accountable for their Actions? 5. *There is more Praying and Faſting. and receiving the Sacraments, more viſiting the Priſoners, and the Sick, more Almsgiving in any of our neighbouring Popiſh Towns, as* Paris, Antwerp, Gant, *&c. than in any Ten Towns of the Reformation.* And is there more *Charity* too? It doth not appear, if they be as ready to cenſure others, and admire themſelves, as our Author, who ſo freely gives his Judgment about a matter it is impoſſible for him to know.

We ſee no reaſon to admire or imitate the manner of their Praying, and Faſting, and receiving the Sacraments; for *to pray without underſtanding, to faſt without Abſtinence, to receive a maimed Sacrament,* are things we do not envy them for; but altho our Devotion be not ſo pompous, and full of ſhew, yet We may pray and faſt in ſecret, according to our Saviours Directions, far more than they do; however our People are mightily to blame if they do not underſtand what they pray for, if they do not receive more of the Sacrament than they; and we verily believe there are as great and remarkable Inſtances of *true Charity* among thoſe of the Church of *England,* as among any People in the World.

XXXII. Of

XXXII. Of Miracles.

HE *is ſo given up to the belief of* idle Stories *and* ridiculous Intentions *in favour of his* Saints, *which he calls* Miracles, *that nothing can be related ſo every way abſurd, fooliſh, and almoſt impoſſible, but it gains credit with him, and he is ſo credulouſly confident of the truth of them, that there's no difference to him, betwixt theſe* Tales, *and what he reads in* Scripture. *'Tis a pretty* Romance, *to ſee what is recounted of St.* Francis's Cord, *the* Scapular, *St.* Anthony, *St.* Bridget, *and other ſuch* Favourites *of Heaven. He that has but read the Atchievements of theſe, may excuſe the peruſal of* Bevis *of* Southampton, *the* Seven Champions, *or* Quevedo's Dreams; *For theſe are nothing to compare to the former, either for the* rare *invention,* wonderful *ſurpriſes, or performance of* impoſſibilities.

HE is not oblig'd to believe any one *Miracle*, beſides what is in the *Scripture*; and for all others, he may give the credit, which in *prudence* he thinks they deſerve; conſidering the *Honeſty* of the *Relator*, the *Authority* of the *Witneſſes*, and ſuch other circumſtances, which on the like occaſions uſe to gain his aſſent. And if upon the account of meer Hiſtory, and the conſent of Authors, few make any doubt, but that there was ſuch a one as *Cæſar, Alexander, Mahomet, Luther*, &c. Why ſhould he doubt of the truth of many *Miracles*, which have not only the like conſent of *Authors* and *Hiſtory*, but alſo are atteſted by great numbers of *Eye-witneſſes*, examin'd by *Authority*, and found upon Record, with all the formal ties due to ſuch a *Proceſs*? St. *Auguſtine* relates many *Miracles* done in his time, ſo does St. *Jerom*, and other *Fathers*; and if they doubted nothing of them then, Why ſhould he queſtion the truth of them now? He finds, that in the time of the *Old Law*, God favour'd many of his Servants, working *Miracles* by their hands; and he thinks now that God's hand is not ſhortned; that the Diſciples of *Chriſt* are no leſs *Favourites* of Heaven, than thoſe of *Moſes*; and that the *new Law* may be very well allow'd to be as *Glorious*, and as particularly *priviledg'd* as the *Old*: eſpecially ſince Chriſt promiſed that his *Apoſtles ſhould do greater Miracles than ever He himſelf had done.* And what if ſome *Miracles* (recounted by Authors,) are ſo wonderfully *ſtrange*, to ſome they ſeem *Ridiculous* and *Abſurd*? are they the leſs true upon this account? Is not every thing *Ridiculous* to *Unbelievers*? The whole *Doctrine* of Chriſt is a *Scandal to the Jews, and Folly to the Gentiles.* And what more *Abſurd* to one that wants Faith, than the *Miracles* recounted in the *Old Teſtament*? Might not ſuch a one turn them all into

Ridicule and Buffoonry? Take but *Faith* away, and ſee what becomes of *Balaam* and his *Aſs*, *Sampſon* and his *Jaw-bone*, *Elias* and his *Fiery Chariot*, *Elijah's Mantle*, *Ax-head*, and *Dead Bones*, *Gideon's Pitchers*, *Lamps* and *Trumpets* in demoliſhing the Walls of *Jericho*, *Moſes* and his *Burning Buſh*, his holding up his hands for the Victory over his Enemies, his parting of the *Red-Sea*, and *Joſhua's* commanding the Sun to ſtand ſtill, *&c.* Might not theſe, and all the reſt be painted out as *Ridiculous*, as any ſuppoſed to be done ſince Chriſt's time, and be put in the ſame Liſt with the Hiſtory of *Bevis*, or *Guy* of *Warwick*? A little *incredulity*, accompanied with a *preſumption* of meaſuring God's Works by Humane Wiſdom, will really make the greateſt part of them paſs for *Follies*, and *Abſurd Impoſſibilities*. And thô he is ſo far from giving equal aſſent to the *Miracles* related in *Scripture*, and the others wrought ſince, that the former he believes with a *Divine Faith*, and the reſt with an *inferiour* kind of aſſent, according to the Grounds and Authority there is in favour of them, like as he does in Prophane Hiſtory: Yet the *ſtrangeneſs* of theſe, never makes him in the leaſt doubt of the *Truth* of them, ſince 'tis evident to him, that all the Works of *Heaven* far ſurpaſs all his *reaſoning*, and that while he endeavours but to look even into the very *ordinary* things daily wrought by God Almighty, the *Motion* of the *Sun*, *Moon* and *Stars*, the *Flowing* of the *Sea*, the *Growing* of an *Ear of Corn*, the *Light* of a *Candle*, the *Artifice* of the *Bees*, *&c.* he quite loſes himſelf, and is bound to confeſs his own *Ignorance* and *Folly*, and that God is *Wonderful* in all his *Works*, a God *ſurpaſſing* all our knowledge. Whatſoever therefore is related upon good grounds, as done by the extraordinary Power of God, he is ready to aſſent to it, although he ſees neither the *how*, the *why*, nor the *wherefore*; being ready to attribute all to the Honour and Praiſe of his *Maker*, to whoſe Omnipotent Hand, moſt of poor Man's impoſſibles, are none.

XXXII. *Of Miracles.*

1. OUr Author ſaith, *He is not obliged to believe any one Miracle beſides what is in Scripture.*

2. He ſees no Reaſon *to doubt the truth of many Miracles, which are atteſted by great numbers of Eye-witneſſes, examined by Authority, and found upon Record, with all the Formalities due to ſuch a Proceſs.*

Now, how can theſe two things ſtand together? Is not a Man obliged to believe a thing ſo well proved? And if his other Arguments prove any thing, it is, that he is bound to believe them. For he thinks there is as much Reaſon to believe Miracles ſtill, as in the time of the old or new Law. If he can make this out, I ſee no reaſon why he ſhould not be as well obliged to believe them now,

as

as thoſe recorded in Scripture. But I can ſee nothing like a proof of this. And all Perſons of Judgment in their own Church, do grant there is a great difference between the Neceſſity of Miracles for the firſt eſtabliſhing a Religion, and afterwards. This is not only aſſerted by *Toſtatus*, *Eraſmus*, *Stella*, *Andradius*, and ſeveral others formerly; but the very late *French* Author I have ſeveral times mentioned, ſaith it in expreſs Terms. And he confeſſes the great Impoſtures of modern Miracles, which, he ſaith, ought to be ſeverely puniſhed; and that none but Women and weak People think themſelves bound to believe them. And he cannot underſtand what they are good for: Not to convert Hereticks; becauſe not done among them: Not to prove there are no corruptions or errors among them, which is a thing incredible; with much more to that purpoſe, and ſo concludes with *Monſieur Paſchal, That if they have no better uſe, we ought not to be amuſed with them.*

Moyens Surs & Honeſtes. &c. To. 2. p. 149.

But Chriſt promiſed, that his Apoſtles ſhould do greater Miracles than himſelf had done. And what then? Muſt therefore S. *Francis*, or S. *Dominic*, or S. *Roſa*, do as great as the Apoſtles had done? What Conſequence can be drawn from the Apoſtles times to latter Ages? We do not diſpute *God's Omnipotency, or ſay his hand is ſhortned*; but we muſt not from thence infer, that every thing which is called a Miracle is truly ſo; or make uſe of God's Power, to juſtify the moſt incredible ſtories. Which is a way will ſerve as well for a falſe as a true Religion; and *Mahomet* might run to Gods Omnipotency for cleaving the Moon in two pieces, as well as others for removing a Houſe over the Seas, or any thing of a like nature.

But, he ſaith, *their Miracles are not more ridiculous and abſurd than ſome in the Old Teſtament.* Which I utterly deny; but I ſhall not run out into the examination of this Parallel, by ſhewing how very different the Nature, Deſign, and Authority of the Miracles he mentions, is from thoſe which are believed in the *Roman* Church. And it had been but fitting, as he ſet down the Miracles of the *Old Teſtament*, ſo to have mentioned thoſe of the *Roman* Church which were to vye with them; but this he was willing to forbear, for certain good Reaſons. *If moſt of poor Man's impoſſibles be none to God*, as he concludes, yet every thing is not preſently true which is not impoſſible; and by this way of Arguing, there can be nothing objected againſt the moſt abſurd and idle Fictions of the Golden Legend, which all Men of Underſtanding among themſelves, not only reject for want of Authority, but of Credibility.

XXXIII. Of Holy Water.

HE *highly approves the Superſtitious uſe of many* inanimate *things, and attributes wonderful effects to ſuch Creatures, which are but in a very inferiour rank, and able to do no ſuch things.* Holy Water *is in great eſteem with him, ſo are* Bleſſed Candles, Holy Oyl *and* Holy Bread, *in which he puts ſo much confidence, that by the Power of theſe, he thinks himſelf ſecure from all Witchcraft, Inchantment, and all the power of the Devil; nay, that by the help of theſe* ſenſeleſs Mediators, *he may obtain remiſſion of his Venial or lighter ſins. And in the uſe of theſe things, he is taught by his* Church *to be ſo obſtinately poſitive, as if he had the Authority of* Fathers *and* Scripture *to back it, when-as there is not the leaſt grain of* Reaſon, *no hint of* Antiquity. *no* Text *throughout the* Word of God *for the defence, command, or even permiſſion of it.*

HE utterly diſapproves all ſorts of *Superſtition.* And yet is taught to have an eſteem for *Holy-Water, Bleſſed Candles, Holy Oyl,* and *Holy Bread*; not doubting, but that as ſuch Men, who have Conſecrated themſelves to the Service of God, in the Preaching the *Geſpel* and Adminiſtration of the Sacraments, have a particular reſpect due to them above the *Laity*: As *Churches* Dedicated to *God*, are otherwiſe to be look'd on, than other *dwelling Houſes*: So likewiſe theſe other Creatures, which are particularly deputed by the Prayers and Bleſſing of the *Prieſt*, to certain uſes for God's own Glory, and the Spiritual and Corporeal good of Chriſtians, ought to be reſpected in a degree above other things. And what *ſuperſtitions* in the uſe of them? Has not God himſelf preſcrib'd ſuch inanimate things, and Holy Men made uſe of them, for an intent above their natural *Power*; and this without any *Superſtition?* Was there *Superſtition* in the *Waters of Jealouſy, Numb.* 5. 17. In the *Shew-Bread*, in the *Tables of Stone*, in the *Salt* us'd by *Elijah* for ſweet'ning the infected Waters, in the *Liver* of the *Fiſh* taken by the Angel *Raphael*, for expelling the Devil? Was it *Superſtition* in Chriſt to uſe *Clay* for the opening the eyes of the Blind; or in the Apoſtles to *impoſe hands* for the bringing down the *Holy Ghoſt* upon Chriſtians; or to make uſe of *Oyl* for the curing of the Sick? *Mark* 6. 13. And thô there be no expreſs *Command* in *Scripture*, for Bleſſing *Water, Bread, &c.* yet there is this aſſurance, that *every Creature is ſanctified by the Word of God and Prayer*, 1 Tim. 4. 5. and frequent *Promiſes*, That God would *hear the Prayers of the Faithful.* Why therefore ſhould he doubt, but that theſe *Creatures*, on which the *Bleſſing* of God is ſolemnly implor'd by the *Word of God*, and the *Prayers* of the Prieſt

Prieſt and People, for their *ſanctification*, are really *ſanctified*, according to the *aſſurance* of the *Apoſtle*, and the *Promiſes* of God? St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, who liv'd in the Third Century, made no queſtion, but that as theſe things which are offer'd to Idols, tho *pure* in their own *nature*, are made *impure* by the *Invocation* of Devils; ſo on the contrary, *ſimple Water* is made *holy*, and gets a *Sanctity*, by virtue receiv'd from the Invocation of the Holy Ghoſt, Chriſt our Lord, and his eternal Father, (*Cyr. Catech.* 3.) St. *Auguſtine* was of the ſame Judgment touching the *Benediction* of *Bread*; affirming, that the *Bread* which the *Catechumens* did take, tho it was not *Chriſt's Body*, yet it was *holy*; yes, and more *holy* than the Meat wherewith we are nouriſh'd, (*Aug. Tom.* 7 *l.* 2. *de Pecc. Mer. & Remiſ c.* 26.) The like is to be ſeen in the Epiſtle of St. *Alexander*, who govern'd the *Church* but fifty years after St. *Peter*; where he declares the *Cuſtom* even at that time of *bleſſing Water*, and confirms the Practice of it by his *Command*. And that Water thus *bleſs'd*, was capable, by virtue receiv'd from Heaven, of working effects above its own nature, was the Sentiment of Chriſtians in the Primitive times; *Epiphanius* makes early mention (*Tom.* 2. *l.* 1. *cont. hær.* 30.) where he relates a paſſage at length, how that Water being *bleſſed in the Name of Jeſus*, and ſprinkled upon Fire which by *Witchcraft* was made inactive, and hindred from burning, immediately the Enchantment ceas'd, and the Fire burn'd: as alſo that a *poſſeſs'd* Perſon being beſprinkled with *bleſs'd Water*, the Party was immediately cured. *Theodoret* has the like Narration of the Devil hindring fire from burning, and how that he was chaſed away, and the Charm diſſolv'd by *bleſſed Water* being thrown on it, (*lib.* 5. *Eccleſ. hiſt. c.* 21.) And does not St. *Hierom* (*in vit. Hilarion, p.* 323. *Paris print.*) make this relation, how that *Italicus* took *Water* from bleſſed *Hilarion*, and caſt it on his bewitched Horſes, on his Chariot, and the Barriers from whence he us'd to run, and that the Charm or Witchery did ceaſe upon the ſprinkling this *Water*; ſo that all cryed out *Marnas victus eſt à Chriſto*, *Chriſt hath conquered Marnas* (the Idol) And now, there's no *jeering* and *ridiculing* theſe things will ever make them look like *idle Superſtitions* to one that conſiders ſeriouſly how much they are grounded upon *Reaſon*, the *Word of God*, *Antiquity*, and the *Authority* and *Practice* of the *Catholick Church*; which tho it approves the uſe of them, yet it teaches plainly, that there is no *Confidence* to be put in any thing but only in *Jeſus Chriſt*; and what power theſe things have they have not of themſelves, but only from *Heaven*, and by the Invocation of the Name of *Jeſus*; who, as by his heavenly *Bleſſing* he enables us to do things above the power of *Nature*; ſo alſo by the Prayers of his *Church* he *bleſſes* theſe things, in order to the working effects *above* their own natural qualities, that by them his Fatherly Benefits may be applied to us, and that ſo the Faithful may more particularly honour and bleſs him in all his Creatures.

XXXIII. *Of*

XXXIII. *Of Holy Water.*

THE *Miſrepreſenter* charges him with *approving ſuperſtitious* uſes of inanimate things, and attributing wonderful effects to them; as Holy-Water, Candles, Oyl, Bread, *&c.*

In Anſwer, our Author 1. declares, *That the Papiſt* truly repreſented, *utterly diſapproves all ſorts of Superſtition.* But if he had deſigned to have repreſented truly, he ought to have told us what he meant by Superſtition, and whether any Man who obſerves the Commands of the Church can be guilty of it.

2. He ſaith, *That theſe things are particularly deputed by the Prayers and Bleſſing of the Prieſt to certain uſes for God's Glory, and the Spiritual and Corporal Good of Chriſtians.*

Hydragiolog. Sect. 3. c. 2. 12. p. 45.

This is ſomewhat too general; but *Marſilius Columna*, Archbiſhop of *Salerno*, who hath taken moſt pains in this matter, ſums them up; 1. *As to Spiritual, they are Seven.* 1. *To fright Devils.* 2. *To remit Venial ſins.* 3. *To cure Diſtractions.* 4. *To elevate the Mind.* 5. *To diſpoſe it for Devotion.* 6. *To obtain Grace.* 7. *To prepare for the Sacrament.*

2. *As to Corporal.* 1. *To cure Barreneſs.* 2. *To multiply Goods.* 3. *To procure Health.* 4. *To purge the Air from peſtilential Vapours.*

And now, as our Author ſaith, *What Superſtition in the uſe of it?* He names ſeveral things of Gods own appointing to Parallel it; as *the Waters of Jealouſy*, *the Shew-bread*, *the Tables of Stone*; but the firſt was miraculous, the other had no ſuch effects that we ever heard of. *Eliſha's Salt for ſweetning the Water*, was undoubtedly a Miracle. Is the *Holy-Water* ſo? As to the *Liver of the Fiſh for expelling the Devil*, in the Book of *Tobit*, he knows the Book is not owned for Canonical by us; and this very place is produced as an Argument againſt it; there being no Ground from Scripture, to attribute the Power of expelling Devils, to the Liver of a Fiſh, either naturally or ſymbolically: *Valleſius* offers at the only probable account of it, that it muſt be a Divine Power given to it, which the Angel *Raphael*, did not diſcover: and yet it is ſomewhat hard to conceive, how this Liver ſhould have ſuch a power to drive away any kind of Devil, as it is there expreſſed, unleſs by a Devil there, no more be meant than ſome violent Diſeaſe, which the *Jews* generally believed to ariſe from the poſſeſſion of evil Spirits: But however here is an Angel ſuppoſed, who made this known to

Valleſ. Sacr. Philoſoph. c. 18. p. 229.

Tobit;

Tobit; but we find not *Raphael* to discover the virtue of Holy Water against Devils. As to *Christ using Clay to open the Eyes of the Blind*, it is very improperly applied, unless the same miraculous Power be supposed in it, which was in Christ himself: And so is the *Apostles laying on of Hands, and using Oyl for miraculous Cures*; unless the same Gift of Miracles be in every Priest which consecrates Holy Water, which was in the Apostles: And *Bellarmine* himself confesses, *That no infallible effect doth follow the use of Holy Water, because there is no Promise of God in the case, but only the Prayers of the Church. But these are sufficient to sanctifie the Water*, saith our Author; And to what end? For all the spiritual and corporeal benefits before mentioned? Is no promise of God necessary for such purposes as those? How can any Church in the World dispose of God's Power without his Will? It may appoint significant and decent Ceremonies, but it can never appropriate divine Effects to them; and to suppose any divine Power in things which God never gave them, is, in my Opinion, Superstition; and to use them for such ends, is a superstitious use. St. *Cyril*, whom he quotes, speaks of the Consecration of the Water of Baptism, *Catech. 3.* St. *Augustine* only of a consecrated Bread, which the *Catechumens* had (*De Peccat. Merit. & Remiss.* l. 2. c. 26.) but he attributes no divine Effects to it. Pope *Alexanders Epistle* is a notorious Counterfeit. Those Passages of *Epiphanius*, *Theodoret*, and S. *Jerom*, all speak of miraculous effects; and those who had the power of Miracles might sometimes do them with an external sign, and sometimes without, as the Apostles cured with anointing, and without: But this is no ground for consecrating Oyl by the Church, or Holy Water, for miraculous Effects. If these Effects which they attribute to *Holy Water* be miraculous, then every Priest must have not only a power of Miracles himself, but of annexing it to the Water he consecrates; if they be super-natural, but not miraculous, then Holy Water must be made a Sacrament to produce these Effects *ex opere operato*; if neither one nor the other, I know not how to excuse the use of it from *Superstition*.

De Cultu Sanct. l. 3. c. 7.

XXXIV. Of Breeding up People in Ignorance.

HE is train'd up in Ignorance; *and 'tis the chief means made use of*

HE has all the liberty, encouragement, and convenience of becoming

by his Church, *for preſerving Men in that* Communion *to hide from them her manifold* Myſteries *of Iniquity, her ſottiſh* Superſtitions, *her un-chriſtian* Doctrines, *by performing all in* unknown Tongues, *and not permitting the poor miſled People to look into, or underſtand any thing that they Believe or Profeſs. And by this* blindneſs *they are perſwaded to embrace ſuch infinite numbers of* groſs Errors *that were but the Vail taken from their eyes but for one half hour, and they but permitted to have one fair proſpect of their Religion, thouſands and thouſands would daily deſert her, and come over to the* Truth.

ning *learned*, of any People or Perſwaſion whatſoever. And none that has ever look'd over any *Library*, and found that the greateſt numbers and choiceſt Books of all Sciences, have men of his *Communion* for their *Authors*: None that in his Travels has taken a thorough view of the *Univerſities* in *Popiſh* Countries, of the *Sorbon, Louvain, Salamanca, Boloign*, &c. and conſider'd their laborious Studies, in *Philoſophy, Divinity, Hiſtory*, the *Fathers, Councils, Scripture*, &c. and beſides the Students here, has ſeen how many thouſands there are in *Religious Houſes*, who, free from the diſturbances of the World, make Virtue and Learning the buſineſs of their whole Life; will ever lay *Ignorance* to the charge of the *Papiſts*; but muſt in Juſtice confeſs, that amongſt them are to be found as *many* and as *great Scholars* as amongſt any People or Societies in the World. And tho the *vulgar* and *common ſort*, of that *Profeſſion*, underſtand not *Latin*, yet are not they train'd up in *ignorance* of their Religion, nor led along in *blindneſs*; but are ſo provided of Books in their own *Mother-Tongue*, of Inſtruction and Devotion, wherein is expl cated the *whole Duty* of a *Chriſtian*, every *Myſtery* of their *Faith*, and all the *Offices* and *Ceremonies* perform'd in the *Church*; that they muſt be very negligent, or elſe very meanly parted, who do not arrive to a ſufficient knowledge of their *Obligation* in every reſpect. And whoſoever has ſeen the great pains and care ſome *good men* take abroad, in Explicating (on *Sundays* and *Holy-days* in their Churches, and on *Week-days* in the Streets,) the *Chriſtian Doctrine* to the crowds of the ignorant and meaner ſort of People, not omitting to reward ſuch as anſwer well with ſome ſmall gifts, to encourage Youth, and provoke them to a commendable Emulation; will never ſay, that the *Papiſts* keep the poor people in *Ignorance*, and hide from them their *Religion*; but rather that they uſe all means for inſtructing the *Ignorant*, and omit nothing that can any ways conduce to the breeding up of *Youth* in the knowledge of their *Faith*, and letting them ſee into the *Religion* they are to profeſs. Neither does it ſeem to him even ſo much as probable, that if the *Church-Offices* and *Service*, &c. were perform'd in the *vulgar-tongue*, that upon this the *now-ignorant* and *blinded* People would immediately diſcover ſo many *idle Superſtitions, ſenſleſs Devotions*, and *groſs Errors*, that they would in great numbers, upon the ſight, become *deſerters* of that *Communion*

nion in which now they are profeſs'd *Members*. For ſince there is nothing done but in a Language which the Learned, Judicious, and Leading Men of all Nations do every where underſtand, and yet theſe eſpy no ſuch *Ridiculoſities* which fright them from their *Faith*; but notwithſtanding the ſeeing all thro' and thro', they yet admire all for *ſolid*, *holy*, and *Apoſtolical*, and remain ſtedfaſt in their *Profeſſion*; how can it be imagin'd that the vulgar, weak, and unlearned ſort, (did they but underſtand all as well as they) would eſpy any ſuch Errors and Superſtitions which theſe others, with all their Learning and Judgment cannot diſcover? No, he thinks there's no reaſon to fear, that what paſſes the Teſt among the *Wiſe* and *Learned*, can be groundedly call'd in queſtion by the *Multitude*.

XXXIV. *Of breeding up People in Ignorance.*

THE *Miſrepreſenter* charges them with this, on theſe accounts. 1. By keeping their Myſteries of Iniquity from them. 2. By performing Divine Service in an unknown Tongue. 3. By an implicite Faith. To which the *Repreſenter* anſwers. 1. *That they give encouragement to Learning*; and he inſtances *in their Univerſities and Conventual Libraries*; But what is all this to the common People? But their *Indices Expurgatorii, and prohibiting Books ſo ſeverely*, which are not for their turn, (as we have lately ſeen in the new one of *Paris*) argues no great confidence of their Cauſe, nor any hearty love to Learning: And if it could be rooted out of the World, their Church would fare the better in it; but if it cannot, they muſt have ſome to be able to deal with others in it. 2. As to the common People he ſaith, *They have Books enough to inſtruct them.* Is it ſo in *Spain* or *Italy*? But where they live among Heretícks, as we are called, the People muſt be a little better inſtructed to defend themſelves, and to gain upon others. 3. *If the People did know their Church Offices and Service*, &c. *they would not find ſuch faults, ſince the Learned approve them* Let them then try the Experiment, and put the Bible and their Church-Offices every where into the Vulgar Tongues: But their ſevere Prohibitions ſhew how much they are of another Opinion: What made all that Rage in *France* againſt *Voiſins* Tranſlation of the *Miſſal*? Such Proceedings of the Aſſembly of the Clergy againſt it; ſuch Complaints both to the King and the Pope againſt it, as tho all were loſt if that were ſuffered? Such an Edict from the King, ſuch a Prohibition from the Pope in ſuch a tragical Stile about it? Such a * Collection of Authors to be printed on purpoſe againſt it? Do theſe things ſhew, even in a Nation of ſo free a temper, in Comparison, as the *French*,

* Collectio Authorum Vulg. Verſionis damnantium Juſſu. ac Mandato Cleri Gallicani edita Lutet. Paris. 1661.

French, any mighty Inclination towards the encouraging this Knowledg in the People? And ſince that, what ſtirs have there been about the *Mons* Teſtament; What Prohibitions by Biſhops? beſides a Bull from this very Pope againſt it. What vehement Oppoſition by others? So that many Volumes have already been written on the occaſion of that Tranſlation. And yet our Author would perſwade us, *That if we look abroad, we ſhall find wonderful care taken to keep the People from Ignorance*; but we can diſcern much greater to keep them in it.

XXXV. Of the Uncharitableneſs of the Papiſts.

HIs *Church teaches him to be very uncharitable; it being her conſtant Doctrine, that none out of her Communion can be ſaved. So that let a man be never ſo honeſt in his Dealing, never ſo juſt to his Neighbour, never ſo charitable to the Poor, and conſtant in his Devotion to his Maker; yet all this ſhall avail him nothing, if he be not a Member of his* Church. *'Tis not enough for him to believe in Jeſus Chriſt, to confeſs him his Redeemer, to believe that he died for our Sins, that he roſe again, and aſcended into Heaven; unleſs he believes and aſſents to every Article and Tenet declar'd by any of his* General Councils; *for that obſtinately to deny any one of theſe, does as certainly place him at the* Left Hand *of the* Judge, *as if he perverſly ſtood out againſt the truth of Chriſtianity, and denied* Jeſus Chriſt *to be God. And by this means, as many as by his Church are mark'd out for* Schiſmaticks *or* Hereticks, *are to expect nothing but Damnation; or rather are condemned already.*

HIs Church teaches him no *uncharitableneſs* at all, and the Doctrine ſhe delivers concerning the deſperate Eſtate of *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks*, is nothing but what ſhe has learnt from the mouth of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. Among the laſt advices, recommended by our Saviour at his Aſcenſion, is found the Sentence of Doom pronounced againſt all ſuch as would not receive the Doctrine preach'd by the *Apoſtles*, *Preach the Goſpel* (ſays Chriſt, *Mark* 16. 16.) *to every Creature: he that believeth, and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved: but he that believeth not, ſhall be damned.* And this is all his Church delivers in this point, repeating the ſame Sentence of condemnation againſt all ſuch, as will not receive and believe the Doctrine left by Chriſt, and preached by his Apoſtles. And if among thoſe that believe not, ſhe comprehends not only *Infidels* and *Heathens*, but alſo all *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks*; 'tis nothing but what ſhe has receiv'd from the Apoſtles; who did not only ſhake the duſt off

off their Feets in witneſs againſt thoſe who denied them entrance, and refuſed to believe in Jeſus, but alſo denounc'd ſuch of the Brethren to ſtand guilty of damnation, who notwithſtanding their belief in Jeſus, that he died for the Redemption of Man, and that riſing again he Aſcended into Heaven; did make *Diviſions* amongſt the Faithful, or Preached any new Doctrine contrary to what they had deliver'd. St. *Paul* is very expreſs in this, who foretelling *Timothy* (1 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2, 3.) of ſome, who in latter times would come and Preach a Doctrine, *Forbidding to Marry, and commanding to abſtain from Meats, which God hath created to be received*: brands them with the infamous Title of Men that *depart from the Faith, giving heed to ſeducing Spirits, and Doctrines of Devils.* In theſe words plainly letting him underſtand, that though theſe Men would not deny Chriſt, yat that their falſe Doctrine in thoſe two other Points, were enough to make them *Seducers, Deſerters* of *Chriſt*, and *Leaders* to the *Devil.* And does not he as expreſly in his 2*d Epiſtle to Timothy*, (*c.* 2. *v.* 16, 17, 18.) condemn *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*, for *prophane and vain babblers, increaſers of Ungodlineſs, and overthrowers of the Faith, who concerning the Truth erred* only in one Point, *ſaying that the Reſurrection is paſt already*? By which 'tis manifeſt to him, that the Doctrine now taught him by his Church, is nothing but what ſhe has learnt from St. *Paul*, and the reſt of the Apoſtles; it being deliver'd by them that he is a *Lyar who denieth that Jeſus is the Chriſt*, (1 *Joh.* 2. 22.) And *that every ſpirit that confeſſes not, that Jeſus Chriſt, is come in the fleſh, is not of God.* (*ib. c.* 4. *v.* 3.) And not only this, but likewiſe *A man that is an Heretick, after the firſt and ſecond admonition, reject*; *knowing that he that is ſuch, is ſubverted and ſinneth, being condemned of himſelf*, (*Tit.* 3. 10, 11.) With this weighty advice to the *Brethren*, in which they are commanded *in the Name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, to ſpeak all the ſame thing, that there be no diviſions among them, but that they be perfectly joined together in the ſame mind and in the ſame judgment*, (1 *Cor.* 1. 10.) For that having *ſtrife and diviſions among them, they will ſhew themſelves to be Carnal, and to walk as Men*, (*ib. c.* 3. *v.* 3.) That therefore, there *being but one Body, and one Spirit, one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptiſm, they ſhould endeavour to keep the Unity of the Spirit, in the Bond of Peace, and not be toſſed to and fro like Children, and carried about with every Wind of Doctrine, by the ſlight of men, and cunning Craftineſs, whereby they lye in wait to deceive*, (*Epheſ. c.* 4. *v* 3, 4, 5, 14.) *Who transforming themſelves into the Apoſtles of Chriſt, are falſe Apoſtles, deceitful Workers*, (2 *Cor.* 11. 13.) But certainly *accurſed*, for that *troubling the Faithful, they would pervert the Goſpel of Chriſt, and preach another Goſpel, than that which had bin preach'd by the Apoſtles* (*Gal.* 1. 7, 8.) And this is the Sum of the Doctrine of his Church, which believing that Faith is neceſſary to Salvation, it being *impoſſible without Faith to pleaſe God*, (*Heb.* 11. 6.) teaches likewiſe, that the *Faithful* ought to hold faſt the profeſſion of their

Faith without *wavering*, for that not only they loſe it; who deny *Jeſus Chriſt* to be God, as ſome have done: but alſo all thoſe, who endeavor to pervert the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt*, and in any point of Faith obſtinately deny, or teach otherwiſe than was taught by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, as *Hymeneus* and *Philetus* did: ſo that, that Chriſtian makes but a very imperfect and lame profeſſion of his Faith, who can only ſay, *I believe that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh, and that he is God and Man, the Redeemer of the World*: unleſs he can with truth add this likewiſe, *I alſo believe the whole Goſpel that he preach'd, and every point of Faith, that he has taught and deliver'd to us by his Apoſtles*: there being the ſame Obligation to obey his Precepts, and hearken to his Words, as to acknowledg the Divinity of his Perſon; and it being a ſin of the ſame blackneſs, obſtinately to oppoſe any point of his *Doctrine*, as to deny the truth of his *Perſon*. 'Tis not therefore any *uncharitableneſs* in his Church, to declare plainly this miſerable unhappy ſtate of all ſuch, who wilfully *oppoſe* and *ſeparate* from the *Doctrine* of Chriſt, deliver'd by the Apoſtles, and continued in the Catholick Church; and of ſuch who *diſobey* and *ſeperate* from the *Government* of the ſame Church, which Chriſt has Commanded all to hear and obey: But 'tis her Zeal ſo to do, and the ſame ſolicitude for the ſalvation of Souls, which mov'd the Apoſtles heretofore, to Preach the like Doctrine to their Flock; as alſo the Primitive Chriſtians to expel their Communion, and Anathematize all ſuch, who by broaching erroneous Tenets, contrary to any point of Receiv'd Doctrine, or by diſobedience, did wilfully *divide* themſelves from the *Belief* or *Diſcipline* of the *Catholick Church*: Such as were *Marcion*, *Baſilides* and *Bardeſanes*, who were Condemn'd in the Firſt Age, for oppoſing that Article of our Faith, in which we believe the *Reſurrection of the Dead*; ſuch the *Archonticks*, Condemn'd likewiſe for denying the *neceſſity of Baptiſm*: Such *Tatianus* &c. for Preaching *Marriage to be unlawful*. Such the *Millenarians*, for maintaining a thouſand Years Reign of Chriſt upon Earth, with his Saints in ſenſual pleaſures. And ſo in all Ages others were condemn'd upon the like account. It having been always, a received Cuſtom, even in the pureſt time of the Goſpel, for the Elders and Prelates, to whoſe charge Chriſt committed the care of his Flock, to oppoſe all thoſe that by new Doctrine, or by making *Schiſms and Diviſions*, did diſturb its peace: and not to permit any that by ſuch like means did endeavour to deſtroy his Unity, ſo much deſired and recommended by the Apoſtles. So that they were equally declar'd Enemies of Chriſtianity, who denyed Chriſt, and they, who confeſſing Chriſt, did yet contradict and reject any part of his Doctrine. And this upon the Principle, that *Chriſtian Faith ought to be entire*. For that every Article, Myſtery and Point of it being deliver'd by the ſame hands, and recommended by the ſame *Authority*; whoſoever did oppoſe any one Point of it, was immediately judg'd guilty of all.

in

in discrediting the *Authority*, on which the whole stood equally grounded. And this is that great Truth proclaimed above thirteen hundred years ago, and now every where read in St. *Athanasius's Creed*. *Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholick Faith. Which Faith, except every one do keep Whole and undefiled, without doubt, he shall perish everlastingly.* By which words was made known to the Christian World the Sense and Doctrine of the then pure and unspotted Church, as receiv'd from Christ and his Apostles. That it is vain for any one to hope for Salvation, unless he first believe the *Catholick Faith*; and that whosoever does not believe *it Whole and undefiled*, shall certainly perish everlastingly. Which is a Doctrine like that deliver'd by the Apostle, concerning the observance of the Laws of God; that as whosoever *fails in one, is made guilty of all*; so also, whosoever disbelieves one Article of the Catholick Faith, does in a manner disbelieve all. There being no more hopes of Salvation for one that denies obstinately any *one* Point of the Catholick Faith, thô he believes all the rest; than there is for one, who keeps *Nine* of the Commandments, with the Breach of the *Tenth*. An obstinate opposition against one Point of Faith, and a sin against one Commandment being as certainly damnable, as if 'twere against *all*. There being the same reason, and an equal necessity that the Observance of God's Law, and the Assent to the Catholick Faith be *alike entire* and *Whole*. And now being convinc'd, that none can believe to Salvation, but he that embraces the Catholick Faith thus *wholly* and *entirely*, by an equal submission to all the *Mysteries* contain'd in it, without opposition to any. And being likewise convinc'd, that no one can arrive to the true knowledg of this Faith, with an assurance of its *Integrity*, but by receiving it as propos'd and believ'd by the *Church of Christ*: *Which Church* was founded by the Son of God, watered with his Blood, and by an infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost (by which it was to be taught all Truth to the end of the World) was secur'd from the danger of being deceiv'd or deceiving others, to the consummation of things: He does not doubt, but as in the Apostles time, so also ever since, and at present, *God addeth to his Church daily such as shall be saved*, (*Acts* 2. 47) there being no *entire faith* necessary to Salvation, to be found out of this *Church*; and no possibility, as St. *Cyprian* says, that *God* shall be a *Father* to any, who own not this *Church* for his *Mother*. But now, *where* and *which* this *Church* is, and what Society of Men are Members of it, among such variety of Pretenders; though it may seem a great difficulty to some to distinguish; yet to him it is none at all; for since there is no other Church, besides the *Roman Catholick*, which has had a continued and visible Succession of Bishops and Pastors in all Ages since the Apostles; no other that has converted Infidel Nations to Christianity; no other that has always preserv'd Peace and Unity amongst

amongſt its Members, all of them ſpeaking the ſame thing, and being perfectly joyn'd together in the ſame mind, and the ſame judgment; no other that by aſſembling the Elders and Prelates, has oppos'd in all Ages Hereſies and Schiſms, and condemn'd all thoſe, who not ſparing the Flock, have ſpoken perverſe things, endeavouring to draw away Diſciples after them; no other, that has, in obedience to the command of Chriſt, ſend Apoſtles amongſt Infidels and Unbelievers, for the preaching to them the Goſpel, and inſtructing them in Chriſtianity; and by this way, without Arms or Blood, have ſpread their Faith throughout the World; no other, that by evident and undeniable Miracles, have prov'd the truth of her Doctrine; no other, but what has begun by *Separation*, whoſe firſt Preachers have *gone out* from this; the time of their firſt Preaching and ſhewing themſelves to the World, being upon Record, and their new Doctrine cenſur'd and condemn'd by that Church, from whence they *ſeparated*. Since, I ſay, there's no other Society or Chriſtian Congregation in the World, to which theſe certain Marks of the Church of Chriſt does agree; 'tis evident to him, that this is the only true Church; that whoſoever denies any Article of her Faith, denies ſo much of Chriſt's Doctrine; that whoſoever hears her, hears Chriſt; and whoſoever obſtinately and wilfully is ſeparated from her, is in the ſame diſtance ſeparated from Chriſt himſelf; and finally, that *God addeth to this Church daily ſuch as ſhall be ſaved*, (Acts 2. 47.)

XXXV. *Of the Uncharitableneſs of the Papiſts.*

THE *Miſſrepreſenter*, (as he is called) charges this Point home, *Becauſe they deny Salvation to thoſe who believe all the Articles of the Chriſtian Faith in the Apoſtles Creed, and lead vertuous and good Lives, if they be not of their Communion.*

To this the *Repreſenter* anſwers in plain terms, *That this is nothing but what they have learn'd from the Mouth of Chriſt and his Apoſtles.* And to this end he muſters up all their Sayings againſt Infidels, falſe Prophets, *Gnoſticks*, *Corinthians*, as thô they were point-blank levelled againſt all that live out of Communion of the Church of *Rome*.

But *this is no Uncharitableneſs, but pure zeal, and the ſame the Primitive Church ſhewed againſt Hereticks, ſuch as* Marcion, Baſilides, *and* Bardeſanes, *who were condemned in the firſt Age for denying the Reſurrection of the dead*, &c. What in the firſt Age! Methinks the Second had been early enough for them: But this is to let us ſee what Learning there is among you. But do we deny the Reſurrection of the Dead? or hold any one of the Hereſies con-

condemned by the Primitive Church? What then is our Fault, which can merit ſo ſevere a Sentence? *We oppoſe the Church*: What Church? The Primitive Apoſtolical Church? The Church in the time of the four General Councils? I do not think that will be ſaid, but I am ſure it can never be proved: What Church then? *The preſent Church?* Is it then damnable to oppoſe the preſent Church? But I pray let us know what ye mean by it; *The Univerſal Body of Chriſtians in the World?* No, No, abundance of them are *Hereticks and Schiſmaticks* as well as we: *i. e.* All the Chriſtians in the *Eaſtern* and *Southern* parts, who are not in Communion with the Church of *Rome*: So that two parts in three of Chriſtians are ſent to Hell by this Principle; and yet it is no Uncharitableneſs. But ſuppoſe the Church of *Rome* be *the only true Church*, muſt men be damned preſently for oppoſing its Doctrines? I pray think a little better on it, and you will change your Minds. Suppoſe a man do not ſubmit to the Guides of this Church in a matter of Doctrine declared by them, Muſt he be Damned? What if it be the Depoſing Power? Yet his Principle is, *If a Man do not hold the Faith entire, he is gone.* But Popes and Councils have declared this to be a point of Faith; therefore if he doth not hold it, he muſt be damned. There is no way of anſwering this, but he muſt abate the ſeverity of his Sentence againſt us. For upon the ſame Reaſon he queſtions that, we may queſtion many more. And all his Arguments againſt us, will hold againſt himſelf; *For*, ſaith he, *he that disbelieves one Article of Catholick Faith, does in a manner disbelieve all.* Let him therefore look to it, as well as we. But he endeavours to prove *the Roman Catholick Church to be the true Church, by the ordinary Notes and Marks of the Church.* Altho he is far enough from doing it; yet this will not do his buſineſs. For he muſt prove, that we are convinced that it is the true Church, and then indeed he may charge us with *Obſtinate Oppoſition*, but not before. And it is a very ſtrange thing to me, that when their Divines ſay, that Infidels ſhall not be damned for their Infidelity, where the Goſpel hath not been ſufficiently propoſed to them; and no Chriſtian for not believing any Article of Faith till it be ſo propoſed; that we muſt be damned for not believing the Articles of the *Roman* Faith, which never have been, and never can be ſufficiently propoſed to us. Methinks ſuch men ſhould ſtudy a little better their own Doctrine about the ſufficient Propoſal of matters of Faith, before they paſs ſuch uncharitable and unlearned Cenſures.

XXXVI. Of Ceremonies and Ordinances.

HIS *Church, upon the preſumption of being Apoſtolical and Commiſſioned by Chriſt, has brought in ſuch an infinite number of unneceſſary ſuperſtitious* Ceremonies, *that the whole exerciſe of her Religion conſiſts in nothing but a vain Pomp and empty Shew. And whereas Chriſtians are commanded by the Apoſtle to ſerve the Lord in Spirit and* Truth; *She has made void this Precept; and neglecting both Spirit and Truth, has reſtor'd the heavy Yoke of* Jewiſh Rites, *without the leaſt Authority of the* Word of God: *but rather, in expreſs oppoſition to it, has made theſe her humane Inventions take place of the Divine Law. And then beſides her Ceremonies, what an endleſs account is there of other Ordinances, Inſtitutions, Precepts, to which ſhe obliges all in her Communion. How many are her Faſt-days, Rogation and Ember-days? How many her Feſtival and Holy-days? How many her Injunctions on ſeveral degrees of People? That Prieſts ſhall not Marry, that whoſoever is in Orders ſhall be oblig'd to the reciting or ſinging ſuch and ſuch Offices. That Marriage ſhall not be permitted, but at ſome ſet times: and a multitude of other ſuch reſpective Commands, which have no grounds in Scripture, and no other Authority for them, beſides the decrees of ſome* Popes, *who for ſome private Ends, and the making themſelves great, thought fit to lay* theſe burdens *upon the People. Some being firſt inſti-*

HIS Church has appointed a great number and variety of Ceremonies to be uſed in the Celebrating *Divine Service*, in the *Offices* and the Adminiſtration of the *Sacraments*. She has likewiſe many *Obſervances, Ordinances, Conſtitutions*, appertaining to Diſcipline and the Government of the Flock. And all theſe are receiv'd, approv'd, or inſtituted by her, every one in her Communion does embrace, admit, and willingly ſubmit to, without oppoſition, exception, or calling any into queſtion: becauſe, altho the Particulars thus appointed or commanded be not to be found in Scripture; yet there being in the Scripture an expreſs and abſolute Command given to the whole Flock of Chriſt, of following and being obedient to thoſe that have thus order'd theſe things; in virtue of that Command, they voluntarily, and without conſtraint, accept all that is of their Appointment; without excepting againſt any thing, unleſs it be manifeſtly ſinful. And this they look on as a Chriſtian Duty belonging to all ſuch that are, by God's Pleaſure, in ſubjection to the Higher Powers, or under charge. And therefore, as a Servant, having receiv'd a Command from his Maſter, is oblig'd to comply with it, in caſe it be not ſinful, altho he cannot find the thing then particularly commanded, in Scripture; the general Precept of *Servants being obedient to Maſters*

tuted by Pope Telesporus, *as the Fast of* Lent: *Some by* Calixtus, *as the* Ember-days, *Some by Pope* Nicholas, *as the Prohibition of Marriage: And so all the rest. And yet, forsooth, all these must be observed under pain of eternal Damnation, as if God and the Pope commanding were but all one, and had Heaven and Hell equally at their disposure.*

sters being sufficient to let him know his Obligation, and to remove all scruple. And as Children are in Duty oblig'd to perform the Will of their Parents, upon the Command, *Obey thy Father and thy Mother*, whether the thing particularly willed be in Scripture or no; so they judge it the Duty of all Christian People to submit without contention to the Ordinances and Constitutions of their Pastors and Prelates, altho the things particularly order'd by them be not express'd in Scripture; it being a sufficient ground for this their Submission and Obedience, that God has given them a General Command; *Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit your selves: for they watch for your Souls, as they that must give account*, (*Hebrews* 13. 17.) *Remember them which have the Rule over you, who have spoken to you the Word of God, whose Faith follow*, (*Hebrews* 13 7.) So that to them it seems a very fallacious rule, leading to all Confusion and unchristian Contentions, *viz.* That the Higher Powers, our Superiours, Pastors and Prelates, are not to be obeyed, but only in such things as are express'd in Scripture; and as for any other Particulars, whosoever upon Examination cannot find what is commanded by them in *Holy Writ*, may lawfully refuse Submission; nay, he is oblig'd to resist. For however this seems to bear much of the Word of God in the face of it, yet certainly 'tis wholly destructive to it; and under pretence of adhering close to the Scripture, undermines the very Author of it. This the Primitive Christians understood so well, that they detested all such Maxims, and following the Advice of the Apostle, chose rather to trust their Souls in the hands of those, whom God had plac'd over them, by an humble Submission to the Government, and a peaceable Obedience to their Decrees; than by a presumptuous questioning of every thing, and raising vain disputes, to take the *Rule* of the Flock out of the hands of those, to whom God had providentially deliver'd it, and place themselves Judges over the *Church*, their Elders, Prelates and Pastors, whom God had commanded them to hear, and be in Subjection to. So that we never read, that they ever pretended to weigh the Ordinances of their Superiors by their own reasoning, or to bring them to the Test of the Word of God, before the acceptance; but alway judg'd it conform to the Word of God, that their *Governours* should *Rule*, and they *Obey*. Thus when the Apostles observ'd the *Sunday* instead of the *Sabbath*; and met together at *Pentecost*; we don't read that the Faithful then began to turn over their Bibles, to find a Command for

theſe particulars, but with a prompt Obedience readily followed them in the Obſervance. So when Abſtinence from Blood and ſtrangled Meats was order'd by the Elders aſſembled at *Jeruſalem*; (*Acts* 15.) the multitude of Believers having heard the Decree, never murmur'd at it, or call'd it into queſtion, however ſeemingly contrary to the intention of Chriſt, who in abrogating the Law of *Moſes* was thought to have cut off all theſe Obligations; but they all *rejoyced for the Conſolation*, (*ib. v.* 31.) So when St. *Paul* gave orders to the *Corinthians*, (1 *Cor.* 11.) in what manner and poſture they were to behave themſelves at Prayers in their Aſſemblies, both Men and Women; we don't hear that he was challeng'd by any to ſhew by what authority of Scripture he thus reprov'd and preſcrib'd in theſe Particulars, or by what they were oblig'd to receive his Preſcriptions; but with a prompt ſubmiſſion accepted his Orders, not doubting, but ſince it was God's Will to place *Rulers* and *Governours* over them, it muſt be God's Will that they ſhould be obedient to them, in following their Decrees, and obſerving their Conſtitutions. And with this Doctrine of Obedience, Humility, and Submiſſion, all the Primitive Chriſtians were train'd up by the Apoſtles, who zealouſly laboured by this means to preſerve them in Peace and Unity; that ſo they might think all the ſame thing, and be of one mind and one judgment, and without Diviſions; inſomuch, that there is not any one thing ſo often repeated in their Writings, as Exhortations to this Obedience and Submiſſion: See, how, going *through the Cities they deliver'd to them* (the Faithful) *the decrees for to keep, that were ordain'd by the Apoſtles and Elders which were at Jeruſalem*, (*Acts* 16 4.) See how St. *Paul* commands the *Theſſalonians, to hold faſt the Traditions they had been taught by word or by Epiſtle*, (2 Theſſ. 2. 15.) See how he commands the *Hebrews*; *Obey them that have the rule over you. Remember them which have the Rule over you*, (Heb. 13. 7. 17.) See with what earneſtneſs St. *John* urges this; *He that knoweth God heareth us, he that is not of God heareth us not*, (1 Joh. 4. 6.) *hereby know we the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Error.* And then again, does not St. *Paul* commend the *Corinthians* for their Obedience; *Now I praiſe you, Brethren, that you remember me in all things, and keep the Ordinances, as I deliver'd them to you*, (1 Cor. 11. 2.) And then, having given them directions as to their Behaviour in their Aſſemblies, he adds; *But if any man ſeem to be contentious, We have no ſuch cuſtom, neither the Churches of God*, (1 Cor. 11. 16.) And now it being thus evident, that the Church of Chriſt in the Apoſtles time was founded, and preſerv'd by a Submiſſion and Obedience of the Flock to their Paſtors; the *Papiſts* teach and believe, that what was taught and commanded by the Apoſtles to the Faithful then living, ought to be receiv'd as a Doctrine neceſſary for all ſucceeding Ages, and that Submiſſion and Obedience ought to have been as much the Duty of Believers ever ſince as it was then; the Commands and Practice of that time being undoubtedly the

beſt

beſt and only Pattern for the Faithful for all times, even to the end of the World. And they do not only teach this Doctrine of Submiſſion in their Books and Sermons, but alſo obſerve it in their Lives, having in all Ages depended on their Elders and Prelates in all matters touching the Diſcipline and Government of the Church; leaving *Rule* to thoſe whoſe Charge and Office it is to *Rule*; and never believing, that they, who are under Charge and Command expreſly by St. *Paul* to *Remember* and *Obey* thoſe who have the *Rule* over them, can upon any pretence whatſoever, nay, thô an Angel from Heaven ſhould come and Preach otherwiſe, be diſcharg'd from this Chriſtian Obligation, and be exempted from *Remembring* and *Obeying*, whom thus by God, ſpeaking by his Apoſtle, they are Commanded to *Remember* and *Obey*. And upon this ground it is, that in things concerning the *Order* to be obſerv'd in the *Divine Service*, in all *Ceremonies*, *Holy Rites*, *Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions*, and *Ordinances*, they have neither *Nill* nor *Will* of their own; but always receive, and think that the *beſt*, which is Order'd and Appointed by thoſe, to whom, by *Divine Law*, they owe *this Submiſſion and Obedience*, and to whom the Ordering and Appointing theſe things appertains. And therefore, if theſe appoint a Day of *Humiliation* for imploring God's Mercy, or averting his Judgments, they never ſcruple to obſerve it; if a day of *Thankſgiving*, in memory of ſome ſignal Benefit, they likewiſe Obey. If theſe judge it fit, that on every *Friday* ſhould be commemorated the Death and Paſſion of our Redeemer in *Faſting*; and command *Lent* to be obſerv'd, in remembrance and imitation of our Lord's 40 days Faſt in the Deſart, they think it their obligation to do ſo. If theſe order ſuch and ſuch days to be ſet apart, and kept holy in Remembrance and Thankſgiving for the *Incarnation*, *Nativity*, *Circumciſion*, *Reſurrection*, and *Aſcenſion* of *Chriſt*, and for other ſuch like Intentions, they eſteem it ſinful to oppoſe it. If theſe judge it decent, that the Faithful ſhou'd *bow* at the Name of *Jeſus*, ſtand at the reading of the *Goſpel*, proſtrate, or incline themſelves at the *Confeſſion*: If they appoint *Tapers* and *Lamps* to be uſed in *Churches*, to repreſent our Saviour who came to enlighten the World; and *Incenſe* to be uſed, to mind the People, that their Hearts and Prayers ſhould, like the Smoak, aſcend directly toward Heaven: If in the Adminiſtration of the *Sacraments*, in *Exorciſms*, in the *Offices*, and the Celebration of the *Maſs*, theſe determine ſeveral *Rites* and *Ceremonies* to be obſerv'd, for more *Decency*, greater *Solemnity*, and that by ſuch exteriour helps the minds of the Faithful may be moved to the contemplation of the *Sacred Myſteries*, and rais'd more ſenſibly to the Apprehenſion of the Majeſty of God, in whoſe Honour all is perform'd; they look upon themſelves bound to allow and embrace all theſe things, without Reluctance or Oppoſition; always thinking that to be moſt proper which is inſtituted by ſuch who have the *Rule* over them. And if any endeavour to raiſe Diſputes, and be contentious concerning the *Neceſſity* of theſe In-

ſtitutions, *they have no ſuch Cuſtom, neither the Churches of God.* One thing they know to be neceſſary, that is, that they ſhould be *Obedient*; and that in the Service of God they muſt not honour him as the *Jews* did, *Iſa.* 58.13. by *doing their own ways, finding their own Pleaſure, and ſpeaking their own words*; but as Chriſtians are commanded, in a true *Self-denial*, a ſincere *Humility* and *Obedience*, ſubmitting to thoſe whom God has left to rule and govern the Flock. Neither is there any danger of falling back into the *Jewiſh* Law, by approving the allow'd Ceremonies of the Church; it being certain, that in the Abrogation of the Old Law, all Ceremonies were not at the ſame time extinct; but only ſuch as were mere *Types* and *Figures* of things to come in the New Law, which are now fulfill'd: Whilſt others (fit for the raiſing Devotion, and expreſſing the affections of the Soul, and other ſuch ends,) are ſtill commendably retain'd as lawful, and equally neceſſary now, as heretofore: ſuch are, *Kneeling, Faſting, lifting Hands and Eyes to Heaven, Sighing, knocking the Breaſt, days of Humiliation, Thankſgiving, Watching, Hair-cloth, Singing, Impoſitions of Hands, Benedictions, uſing Oyl, Spittle, Breathing, &c.* all which are as lawful, convenient, and neceſſary for *Chriſtians*, as they were for *Jews*; and no more to be neglected, becauſe they were us'd in the *Old Law*, than praying, meeting, Reading the Law, Singing Pſalms, Humility, and Obedience, *&c.* are to be laid by, and diſown'd by *Chriſtians* becauſe they were obſerved by the *Jews*: eſpecially ſince theſe, with many others, have been recommended to us by the practice of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and of all Primitive Chriſtianity. Neither has the uſe of Holy Ceremonies been wholly diſapproved by thoſe of the *Reformation*. The *Engliſh Profeſſion* of Faith, publiſh'd in the year 1562. allows them in the 34*th.* Article. The *Bohemick Confeſſion* in the 15*th.* Article, *Anno* 1537. The *Auguſtine, Tit. de Miſſ Anno* 1530. as it was penn'd by *Melanchon.* So that ſince *Ceremonies* are generally look'd on as commendable and lawful amongſt Chriſtians; the Papiſts judge it proper to thoſe who have the *Rule*, to Order and Diſpoſe of them, and declare to the Flock, *how*, *when*, and *where* they are to be obſerved. And if they who govern judge fit to oblige the Faithful to the obſervance of any in particular, they teach that it is the Duty of the Flock to Obey. Things *indifferent*, after ſuch Commands, being no longer of *choice* but *neceſſary*; and no leſs *obliging*, than the Commands of a Father to his Child; where, in caſe the thing be not apparently ſinful, 'tis no Perſwaſion of the thing being *ſuperfluous*, can excuſe an obſtinate denial from *Diſobedience.* It being more ſafe and Chriſtian like for all that are under any Government, whether Natural, Eccleſiaſtical, or Civil, to perform and comply with ſuch things as they judge in their own private Sentiments *Unneceſſary*, merely upon the account of being *Commanded*, than upon ſuch conſiderations, to diſturb the Order of Government, and fly in the Face of Lawful Authority;

rity; than which nothing is more oppoſite to the Principles of Chriſtianity, and deſtructive of all Humane Society. And upon theſe grounds it is, that the *Papiſts* founding themſelves upon the ſure Foundation of *Humility and Obedience*, have in all Ages acknowledged *Overſeers* and *Rulers over them to watch and feed the Flock*, to whom God hath given *Power; there being no Power but of God, and that whoſoever reſiſteth the Power, reſiſteth the Ordinance of God, and they that reſiſt ſhall receive to themſelves Damnation*, Romans 13. 1, 2.

XXXVI. *Of Ceremonies and Ordinances.*

HIS Diſcourſe on this Head is againſt thoſe who refuſe to obey their Superiours in things not expreſſed in Scripture, which is no part of our Controverſie with them. But yet there are ſeveral things about their Ceremonies we are not ſatisfied in: As, 1. The mighty number of them which have ſo much muffled up the Sacraments, that their true face cannot be diſcerned. 2. The Efficacy attributed to them, without any promiſe from God; whereas we own no more but decency and ſignificancy. 3. The Doctrine that goes along with them, not only of Obedience, but of Merit; and ſome have aſſerted the *Opus Operatum* of Ceremonies as well as Sacraments, when the Power of the Keys goes along with them; *i. e.* when there hath been ſome Act of the Church exerciſed about the matter of them; as in the Conſecration of Oyl, Salt, Bread, Aſhes, Water, *&c.*

XXXVII. Of Innovations in Matters of Faith.

HIS *Church has made ſeveral* Innovations *in matters of* Faith, *and howſoever ſhe lays claim to* Antiquity, *with a pretence of having preſerv'd the Doctrine of the Apoſtles inviolable and entire; yet 'tis evident to any ſerious Obſerver, that the greateſt part of her Belief is* mere Novelties; *that bearing date from Chriſt or his Apoſtles, but only from ſome of her own more modern Synods.*

HIS Church has never made any *Innovation* in Matters of *Faith*; what ſhe believes and teaches now being the ſame that the *Catholick Church* believ'd and taught in the firſt three or four Centuries after the Apoſtles. And though in moſt of her *General Councils* there has been ſeveral Deciſions touching Points of Faith; yet can no one, without an injury

to

There ſcarce having paſs'd any Age yet, wherein there has not, in theſe Eccleſiaſtical Mints, *been coyn'd* New Articles, *which, with the counterfeit ſtamp of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, are made to paſs for* Good *and* Current, *amongſt his credulous and undiſcerning Retainers: And beſides theſe, what a great number of* Errors *have been introduc'd at other times; how many did Pope* Gregory *bring in, and how many the* Ignorance *of the* Tenth Age? *So that if we compare the Church of* Rome *now, with the Primitive times of the firſt three or four hundred years, there are no two things ſo unlike; ſhe is a* Garden *now, but quite overgrown with* Weeds; *ſhe is a Field, but where the* Tares *have perfectly choaked up the* Wheat, *and has little in her of* Apoſtolical, *beſides the* Name.

to truth, ſay, that in any of theſe has been coin'd *new Articles*, or Chriſtians forced to the acceptance of *Novelties*, contrary to the *Scripture*, or ancient *Tradition*. Theſe have only trodden in the *Apoſtles* ſteps, as often as they have been in the like circumſtances with them; doing exactly according to the Form and Example left to the Church by thoſe perfect Maſters of Chriſtianity. And therefore as the *Apoſtles* in their Aſſembly, *Acts* 15. determin'd the Controverſie concerning the *Circumciſion*; and propoſed to the Faithful what was the Doctrine of Chriſt in that point, of *neceſſity* to be believ'd; of which till that Deciſion there had been rais'd ſeveral Queſtions and Doubts; but now no longer to be queſtioned, without the Shipwrack of Faith. So in all ſucceeding Ages the Elders of the Church, to whom the *Apoſtles* left their Commiſſion of *watching over the Flock*, in their Councils have never ſcrupled to determine all ſuch Points which had been controverted amongſt the Brethren, and to propoſe to them what of *neceſſity* they were to believe for the future, with *Anathema* pronounced againſt all ſuch as ſhould preſume to preach the contrary. Thus in the year 325. the firſt *Nicene Council* declar'd the Son of God to be *Conſubſtantial* to his *Father*, againſt the *Arians*; with an Obligation on all to aſſent to this Doctrine, though never till then propos'd or declar'd in that Form. Thus in the year 381. the *Holy Ghoſt* was declar'd to be *God*; againſt *Macedonius* and his Followers, in the firſt *Conſtantinopolitan Council*. And in the firſt *Epheſin*, *Anno* 431. *Neſtorius* was condemned, who maintain'd *two Perſons in Chriſt*, and that the *bleſſed Virgin* was the *Mother of God*; with a Declaration, That both theſe *Tenets* were contrary to the *Catholick Faith*. In the ſecond *Nicene Council*, *Anno* 787. Image-breakers were Anathematiz'd. And ſo others at other times; and at laſt, in the *Council of Trent*, was declar'd the *Real Preſence*, *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Purgatory*, *the lawfulneſs of the Invocation of Saints, of keeping Holy Images, &c.* againſt *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, &c. And now, tho in all theſe and the other *General Councils* the Perſons condemned took occaſion, from theſe *New Declarations*, to cry out, *Novelties, Novelties*, to fright the People with the noiſe of *new coin'd Articles*, and

and that the *inventions of Men* were impos'd on them, for *Faith*. Yet 'tis evident, that theſe *New Declarations* contain'd nothing but the *Antient Faith*; and that there had never been any ſuch *Declarations* made, had not the Doctrine propos'd in them, being oppos'd and contradicted by ſome ſeducing Spirits, who going out from the Flock, endeavour'd by making Diviſions, to draw numbers after them. So that the *new Propoſal* of a Tenet, is but a *fallacious* proof of the Doctrine being *lately invented*, but a *good Argument* of its being *lately oppos'd*. 'Tis certain from *Scripture*, *Acts* 15. that the Apoſtles had never declar'd the *non-neceſſity* of *Circumciſion*, had not certain men come down from *Judea* and taught the Brethren the contrary. And that the *Conſubſtantiality* of the Son, had never been defin'd by the *Nicene Fathers*. had not *Arius*, with his Followers, oppos'd this *Catholick Doctrine*. And as certain it is, that the *Council of Trent* had been altogether ſilent as to *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Praying to Saints*, *Purgatory*, *&c.* had not *Luther*, *Calvin*, and their Diſciples, once profeſſors of this Doctrine, *gone out* from the *Flock*, and upon the preſumption of a *New Light*, endeavour'd to perſwade the Faithful, that theſe Tenets, then believ'd by the whole *Chriſtian* World, were no longer to be own'd, but to be quite thrown by, as *Antichriſtian* and *Diabolical*. 'Twas this oblig'd the *Paſtors* to watch and take care of their Flock, and therefore not flying away, as the *Hireling* does, when the *Wolf catcheth, and ſcattereth the Sheep*, they aſſembled together in a Body, and declar'd to all under their charge, that they ought not to follow ſtrangers; that howſoever they came pretending to the *Shepherd's voice*; yet ſince they *came not by the door into the Sheepfold, but climbing up ſome other way, they were no Shepherds, but Thieves and Robbers*; ſuch whoſe buſineſs was not to feed, but to ſteal, kill and deſtroy. 'Twas this made them encourage all under their care, not to waver; but to ſtand faſt, and hold the profeſſion of their Faith, and notwithſtanding all pretences, by no means to ſuffer themſelves to be deluded, and led away with *Strange Doctrine*; and that they might the better ſecure them from falling into *Errors*, they gave them a Draught of their *Chriſtian Doctrine*; eſpecially of all thoſe points, which theſe *modern ſelf commiſſionated Apoſtles* did preach againſt, and endeavour to undermine; particularly declaring to them, the Faith they had been bred up in, which they had receiv'd from their Forefathers, and been deriv'd even from the *Apoſtles*. Securing them, that whatſoever was contrary to this, was *Novelty* and *Error*. And now in the *Paſtors* declaring this to the *Faithful*, where was the *Innovation*? The *Council* did nothing but propoſe fully and explicately, what, before their meeting, was the Doctrine of all *Chriſtendom*, and had been ſo amongſt the *Primitive Fathers*. 'Twas they made *Innovation*, who preach'd contrary to the Doctrine thus believ'd and receiv'd; which *Luther* was not aſham'd to own himſelf guilty of; plainly acknowledging, that He *ſeperated from the whole World*.

But

There ſcarce having paſs'd any Age yet, wherein there has not, in theſe Eccleſiaſtical Mints, *been coyn'd* New Articles, *which, with the counterfeit ſtamp of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, are made to paſs for* Good *and* Current, *amongſt his credulous and undiſcerning Retainers: And beſides theſe, what a great number of* Errors *have been introduc'd at other times; how many did Pope* Gregory *bring in, and how many the* Ignorance *of the* Tenth Age? *So that if we compare the Church of* Rome *now, with the Primitive times of the firſt three or four hundred years, there are no two things ſo unlike; ſhe is a* Garden *now, but quite overgrown with* Weeds; *ſhe is a Field, but where the* Tares *have perfectly choaked up the* Wheat, *and has little in her of* Apoſtolical, *beſides the* Name.

to truth, ſay, that in any of theſe has been coin'd *new Articles*, or Chriſtians forced to the acceptance of *Novelties*, contrary to the *Scripture*, or ancient *Tradition*. Theſe have only trodden in the *Apoſtles* ſteps, as often as they have been in the like circumſtances with them; doing exactly according to the Form and Example left to the Church by thoſe perfect Maſters of Chriſtianity. And therefore as the *Apoſtles* in their Aſſembly, *Acts* 15. determin'd the Controverſie concerning the *Circumciſion*; and propoſed to the Faithful what was the Doctrine of Chriſt in that point, of *neceſſity* to be believ'd; of which till that Deciſion there had been rais'd ſeveral Queſtions and Doubts; but now no longer to be queſtioned, without the Shipwrack of Faith. So in all ſucceeding Ages the Elders of the Church, to whom the *Apoſtles* left their Commiſſion of *watching over the Flock*, in their Councils have never ſcrupled to determine all ſuch Points which had been controverted amongſt the Brethren, and to propoſe to them what of *neceſſity* they were to believe for the future, with *Anathema* pronounced againſt all ſuch as ſhould preſume to preach the contrary. Thus in the year 325. the firſt *Nicene Council* declar'd the Son of God to be *Conſubſtantial* to his *Father*, againſt the *Arians*; with an Obligation on all to aſſent to this Doctrine, though never till then propos'd or declar'd in that Form. Thus in the year 381. the *Holy Ghoſt* was declar'd to be *God*; againſt *Macedonius* and his Followers, in the firſt *Conſtantinopolitan Council*. And in the firſt *Epheſin*, *Anno* 431. *Neſtorius* was condemned, who maintain'd *two Perſons in Chriſt*, and that the *bleſſed Virgin* was the *Mother of God*; with a Declaration, That both theſe *Tenets* were contrary to the *Catholick Faith*. In the ſecond *Nicene Council*, *Anno* 787. Image-breakers were Anathematiz'd. And ſo others at other times; and at laſt, in the *Council of Trent*, was declar'd the *Real Preſence*, *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Purgatory*, *the lawfulneſs of the Invocation of Saints*, *of keeping Holy Images*, *&c.* againſt *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, &c. And now, tho in all theſe and the other *General Councils* the Perſons condemned took occaſion, from theſe *New Declarations*, to cry out, *Novelties*, *Novelties*, to fright the People with the noiſe of *new coin'd Articles*, and

and that the *inventions of Men* were impos'd on them, for *Faith*. Yet 'tis evident, that these *New Declarations* contain'd nothing but the *Antient Faith*; and that there had never been any such *Declarations* made, had not the Doctrine propos'd in them, being oppos'd and contradicted by some seducing Spirits, who going out from the Flock, endeavour'd by making Divisions, to draw numbers after them. So that the *new Proposal* of a Tenet, is but a *fallacious* proof of the Doctrine being *lately invented*, but a *good Argument* of its being *lately oppos'd*. 'Tis certain from *Scripture*, *Acts* 15. that the Apostles had never declar'd the *non-necessity* of *Circumcision*, had not certain men come down from *Judea* and taught the Brethren the contrary. And that the *Consubstantiality* of the Son, had never been defin'd by the *Nicene Fathers*. had not *Arius*, with his Followers, oppos'd this *Catholick Doctrine*. And as certain it is, that the *Council of Trent* had been altogether silent as to *Transubstantiation*, *Praying to Saints*, *Purgatory*, *&c.* had not *Luther*, *Calvin*, and their Disciples, once professors of this Doctrine, *gone out* from the *Flock*, and upon the presumption of a *New Light*, endeavour'd to perswade the Faithful, that these Tenets, then believ'd by the whole *Christian* World, were no longer to be own'd, but to be quite thrown by, as *Antichristian* and *Diabolical*. 'Twas this oblig'd the *Pastors* to watch and take care of their Flock, and therefore not flying away, as the *Hireling* does, when the *Wolf catcheth*, *and scattereth the Sheep*, they assembled together in a Body, and declar'd to all under their charge, that they ought not to follow strangers; that how soever they came pretending to the *Shepherd's voice*; yet since they *came not by the door into the Sheepfold*, *but climbing up some other way*, *they were no Shepherds*, *but Thieves and Robbers*; such whose business was not to feed, but to steal, kill and destroy. 'Twas this made them encourage all under their care, not to waver; but to stand fast, and hold the profession of their Faith, and notwithstanding all pretences, by no means to suffer themselves to be deluded, and led away with *Strange Doctrine*; and that they might the better secure them from falling into *Errors*, they gave them a Draught of their *Christian Doctrine*; especially of all those points, which these *modern self commissionated Apostles* did preach against, and endeavour to undermine; particularly declaring to them, the Faith they had been bred up in, which they had receiv'd from their Forefathers, and been deriv'd even from the *Apostles*. Securing them, that whatsoever was contrary to this, was *Novelty* and *Error*. And now in the *Pastors* declaring this to the *Faithful*, where was the *Innovation*? The *Council* did nothing but propose fully and explicately, what, before their meeting, was the Doctrine of all *Christendom*, and had been so amongst the *Primitive Fathers*. 'Twas they made *Innovation*, who preach'd contrary to the Doctrine thus believ'd and receiv'd; which *Luther* was not asham'd to own himself guilty of; plainly acknowledging, that He *seperated from the whole World*.

But

But it ſeems that the whole World was then corrupted, and the Religion then every where profeſs'd, was overgrown with Superſtitions, Errors and Abominations; ſuch as had crept into the Church, ſome five Hundred Years before, ſome nine Hundred, and ſome a Thouſand; and 'twas from theſe *Luther* ſeperated, intending to *Reform* Chriſtianity, and bring it to the *purity* of the *Primitive* times, of the firſt three Hundred Years. And was it not very ſtrange now, that ſo many groſs *Fooleries*, idle *Superſtitions*, and even down-right *Idolatry*, ſhould creep into a *Church*, and ſpreading it ſelf through all Nations, infect the whole World, becoming the publick profeſſion of Chriſtendom for ſo many hundred Years, and be confirm'd and eſtabliſh'd by the Laws of every Kingdom; and that no body ſhould take notice of any ſuch thing, either at its firſt Riſe, or in all its progreſs of ſo many Years: Inſomuch, that had not *Luther* made the Diſcovery, 'tis likely we ſhould never have come to the knowledge of theſe Thouſand Years Errors and Corruptions: No thinking Man certainly, but judges it impoſſible, that the very *Fundamentals* of *Chriſtianity* ſhould be ſhaken, and the Religion planted by the Apoſtles turned into *Idolatry*; and yet that no Learned Man ſhould any where appear to contradict theſe Abominations, no Zealous *Paſtors* to withſtand them, no pious *Princes* to oppoſe them: Hiſtory ſufficiently ſatisfies any Curious Reader, that from the firſt planting of the *Church*, there has been in no Age, any Man yet that has preach'd any *Heterodox* and *Erroneous Tenets*, and by introducing Novelties, has endeavour'd to infect the minds of the Faithful with *Hereſie* and *Superſtition*, but immediately have ſtood up Virtuous and Learned Men, in defence of the *Truth*, in their Writings and Sermons publickly confuting and condemning the *Errours*, and giving an Alarm to the World, to beware of ſuch *Deceivers*, and their wicked *Doctrine*; and withal, never omitting, to Record their Names to Poſterity; with an account of the *Year* when they began to Preach, under *what Emperours*, and what was the occaſion of their *Revolt*. Was not all this, and even more done againſt *Arius*? How many appear'd againſt the *Manichees*? How many againſt the *Donatiſts*; againſt the *Novatians*, againſt the *Macedonians*, the *Neſtorians*, the *Eutychians*, the *Pelagians*, the *Berengarians*, *&c.* So that never any thing has made ſo much noiſe in the World, ſo many commotions, ſo many diſturbances; nothing has been ſo impoſſible to be carryed on with *ſecreſie* and *ſilence*, as the broaching any new *Hereſie*, the making a *Schiſm*, the *alteration* of *Religion*, the ſtarting up of ſome new Society and Pretenders to *Reformation*. What Tumults did all the fore-mentioned *Apoſtles* raiſe; diſturb'd at the Doctrine of *Mahomet*, and the crying up the *Alcoran*? What Stirs and Commotions at the *Reformation* of *Church* and *Faith*, pretended by *Luther*, *Zwinglius* and *Calvin*? How then can it be judg'd in the leaſt probable, that great variety of *erroneous Tenets* and *Antichriſtian Doctrine* ſhould be introduc'd by the *Papiſts*, contrary to the ſenſe and belief

of

of all Christianity, either in the fourth, fifth, sixth or tenth Century; and yet that there should not be the least disturbance occasion'd by it, no tumults or opposition; but all done with so much quietness, in such a profound Peace and Silence, that had it not been for the *News* brought, some Ages after, we had never suspected the *Alteration*? And is this possible? Is it possible, that the whole Christian World should *change* their *Religion*, both as to the *Internal Belief*, and *external Profession* and *exercise* of it; and no body be sensible of the change, so as to withstand the Abomination, or to transmit to Posterity, even so much as the least word of its beginning or propogation? Let any man upon some consideration, tell me, whether it be possible, that this one little Kingdom of *England* should fall from this *pure Apostolical* Doctrine it *now* professes, into down-right *Popery*, (or any other way *alter* the whole Scheme of its *Religion*) and have the *Alteration* confirmed by several *Acts of Parliament*, and continue in the publick Exercise of it for a thousand, five hundred, or even one hundred years, and yet no one in this Kingdom, or out of it, should be sensible of the *Alteration*; but also to be manag'd with such *Policy* and *Craft*, that the whole business should be a *Secret* for many Ages? And if this be scarce to be thought possible of this one Kingdom; what can be imagin'd, when 'tis affirm'd of many Nations of the whole Christian World; Can any thing look more like a *Fable* or *Romance*? Or can any rational man, barely upon such a *Report*, condemn the *Faith* and *Religion* of his *Ancestors*, for *Novelty* and *Humane Inventions*; and quite laying aside this, take him for the Rule of his *Reformation*, who thus, without Reason, Justice or Truth, has thrown such an Infamy upon all the Christians preceeding him for a thousand years?

But not to insist upon these reasonings, for the wiping off the scandal of *Novelty* from the Doctrine of the *Church* of *Rome*; 'twould not be amiss here, to look beyond the *Tenth Century*, as also beyond the time of *Pope Gregory*. And if in those earlier Christians, nothing can be found of that *Faith* and *Profession*, which is charged as *Novelty* and *Error* against the *Church* of *Rome*, all the *Papists* in the World shall join with their *Adversaries*, and condemning Pope *Gregory* for a *Seducer*, and all of the *Tenth* Age for so many *Ignoramus's*, shall in one voice with them cry out against all such *Doctrine*, *Novelty*, *Novelty*, *Errour*, *Errour*. But if, on the contrary, every *Point* thus challeng'd of *Novelty*, shall appear to have been the *Profession* of the *Faithful* in the time of the *Purity* of the *Gospel*; if before Pope *Gregory* we find that *Invocation of Saints*, *the real Presence*, *Transubstantiation*, *Purgatory*, *Prayer for the Dead*, *the use of Holy Images*, *Relicks*, *the Sign of the Cross*, *Processions*, &c. were a *receiv'd Doctrine*, and *common Practice* of *Christians* in those *Primitive times*; Then shall the *Papists* remain as they are, as being of the same *Faith* and *Religion*, with those *Antient Believers*, without any *Additions* and *Alterations*; and all their *Adversaries* ought in justice to *return* again to their *Communion*, and making up one Quire, cry out with them; *Blessed*

are they who believe as our Forefathers believ'd, who receiv'd their Faith from the Apostles and their Successors; and Accurſed be they, who ſeparate from this Faith, and upon the Noiſe of Novelty and Errour, make Diviſions in the Church, and fall from her Communion, believing Lies rather than Truth.

In order to this, I intended in this place to have given the *Reader* a fair proſpect of the *Doctrine* and *Belief* of the Fathers, at the firſt five hundred years after Chriſt; but finding the matter to increaſe ſo much beyond expectation upon my hands, I have reſerv'd them for another occaſion. But however, upon confidence of what I am able to produce in that point, I cannot omit to aſſure the *Reader*, that the chief, and moſt material Points charg'd upon the Church of *Rome* for *Novelty*, the *Primitive Fathers* do ſo plainly own to have been the *Faith* and *Profeſſion* of the *Church* in their days; and to have been deliver'd down, and taught as the *Doctrine* of the *Apoſtles*; that an impartial Conſiderer need not take much time to conclude, whether are the greater *Innovators*, thoſe that now Believe and Profeſs theſe Tenets and Practices; or they that diſown or reject them. 'Tis evident, that every Point of that Doctrine, which is now decry'd for *Popery*, and baſely ſtigmatiz'd with the note of *Errors* introduc'd of late, and of a modern invention, is by many Ages older than thoſe, who are reputed to be the Authors; that every particular Article laid to the *Ignorance* of the *Tenth Century*, and to the contrivance of *Pope Gregory*, are as expreſly and clearly own'd, and taught ſome Ages before, as it is now at this day. That thoſe Great Men were as down-right *Papiſts* in theſe Points, as we are now. And that any *diſturber* of *Chriſtianity* might have as well defam'd them for believers of *Novelties* and *Errours*, as we are now at this preſent. The *Faith* that they profeſs'd then, we profeſs now; and if any of our Doctrine be *Novelty*, 'tis a *Novelty* of above twelve hundred years ſtanding: And who can queſtion it not to be of an older date? If it was the publick belief of the *Chriſtian World*, in the fourth Century, who can be better Witneſſes of what was believ'd before them, even in the third Age, than They? They tell us, that the Doctrine they maintain and deliver, is the *Faith of the Catholick Church*, receiv'd from their Fore-fathers, and as it was taught by the *Apoſtles*, and we don't find, that in any of theſe Points, they were challeng'd by any Authority, or oppoſed by the Paſtors of the Church, or any Writers, either then living, or ſucceeding them, but received always with great veneration; And upon what grounds can any challenge them now? Is it poſſible, that any living now, can give a better account of what was believ'd and practis'd in the third Age, than They that immediately follow'd them: Which will be more credible Witneſſes of what was done in *Forty Eight*; thoſe that ſhall be alive fifty years hence; or they that are not yet to come theſe thouſand years? If therefore theſe Holy Men declare to us the Doctrine they believ'd; with aſſurance, that it was the Faith of the *Catholick Church*, ſo believ'd by their Anceſtors, and as they had receiv'd it from the Apoſtles and their Suc-

Succeſſors; do not they deſerve better credit, than others, who coming a thouſand years after, cry out againſt all theſe ſeveral Points, that they are nothing but *Novelty* and *Errour?* 'Tis evident therefore to him, that this noiſe of *Novelty*, was nothing but a *ſtratagem* for the introducing of *Novelties*; and that thoſe that brought an Infamy upon theſe Points, by this aſperſion, might with as great applauſe every, and as eaſily have laid a ſcandal upon other Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, which they thought fit to retain, and have had them all exploded for *Novelty*. And this has been ſo far done already, that even three parts of that Doctrine, pick'd out by the *firſt Reformers*, for *Apoſtolical*, and conform to the *Word of God*, we have ſeen in our days clamour'd againſt for *Novelty*, and thrown by with as general Approbation, and as clear Evidence of the charge, as ever they laid by *Tranſubſtantiation* and the *Primacy*. The *firſt Reformers* caſt off the Authority of the *firſt Biſhop*, as being a *Novelty*; *Others* ſoon after cry'd down the Authority of *all Biſhops*, for a *Novelty*. The *Firſt* diſown'd a great part of the *Prieſtly Function*, as being lately crept in; the *Others* diſown'd all the reſt, and even *Ordination* it ſelf, as having all crept in together. The *Firſt* threw out a great number of *Ceremonies*, as being not *Apoſtolical*, but of a modern Inſtitution: The *Others* threw out even what they had retain'd, for being no more an Ordination of the *Apoſtles*, than the former. The *Firſt* laid by five of the *Sacraments*; the *Others* laid by the *other two*. And thus *Novelty* was the *Word*, whenſoever any receiv'd Doctrine of Chriſtianity was to be outed, and may to be made for a *Novelty*: And he does not doubt, but, that if the noiſe of *Novelty* continue long, ſo unhappily ſucceſsful as of late, and the liberty be permitted to every *preſuming Spirit*, to fix this ſcandal upon whatſoever Doctrine or Inſtitution they ſhall think fit; that all Chriſtianity is in a fair way of being thrown out of doors: And the *Bible*, *Preaching*, *Catechiſing*, *Chriſt's Incarnation* and *Paſſion*, *&c.* is as likely to be caſt off for a *Novelty*, as all the reſt have been. Thoſe that will but ſhew to the People, that even theſe things have been all receiv'd from *Rome*, and that the *Papiſts* by their *Miſſionaries*, ſpread theſe Doctrines over the World, may ſoon perſwade them, they are nothing but *Popiſh Inventions*, meer *Novelties*; that thoſe that began the *Reformation*, did their buſineſs by halves, and that the World will never be *throughly Reform'd*, till all theſe *Romiſh Superſtitions*, are laid by with the reſt; they being of the ſame date. He takes no notice thereof of all the clamours rais'd againſt ſeveral points of the receiv'd Doctrine of his *Church*; his Faith is founded on better Principles, than to be ſhaken with ſuch a *Vulgar Engine*. *Novelty*, *Novelty*, is a cry, that may fright unthinking Men from their Religion; but every ſerious Man will require better Motives than a *Noiſe*, before he forſake any point of his Faith; and 'tis impoſſible he ſhould joyn with any in condemning ſuch things for *Novelties*, which he finds the Profeſſion of all *Antiquity*.

XXXVII. *Of Innovation in matters of Faith.*

THE Substance of his Discourse on this Head may be reduced to these things. 1. *That the Church in every Age hath Power to declare what is necessary to be believed, with Anathema to those who Preach the Contrary; and so the Council of* Trent, *in declaring Transubstantiation, Purgatory,* &c. *to be necessary Articles, did no more than the Church had done before on like Occasions.* 2. *That if the Doctrines then defined had been Innovations, they must have met with great Opposition when they were introduced.* 3. *That those who charged those points to be Innovations, might as well have laid the scandal on any other Article of Faith which they retained.*

These are things necessary to be examined, in order to the making good the charge of Innovation in matters of Faith, which we believe doth stand on very good Grounds.

1. We are to consider, Whether the Council of *Trent* had equal Reason to define the necessity of these points, as the Council of *Nice* and *Constantinople* had to determin the point of the Trinity; or those of *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon*, the Truth of Christ's Incarnation. He doth not assert it to be in the Churches Power to make new Articles of Faith, as they do imply new Doctrines reveal'd; but he contends earnestly, That the Church hath a Power to declare the necessity of believing some points which were not so declared before. And if the Necessity of believing doth depend upon the *Churches* Declaration, then he must assert, that it is in the *Churches* Power to make points necessary to be believed which were not so; and consequently to make common Opinions to become Articles of Faith. But I hope we may have leave to enquire in this Case, since the *Church* pretends to no new Revelation of matters of Doctrine, therefore it can declare no more than it receives, and no otherwise than it receives. And so nothing can be made necessary to Salvation but what God himself hath made so by his Revelation. So that they must go in their Declaration either upon Scripture, or Universal Tradition; but if they define any Doctrine to be necessary without these Grounds, they exceed their Commission, and there is no Reason to submit to their Decrees, or to believe their Declarations. To make this more plain by a known Instance: It is most certain that several Popes and Councils have declared the Deposing Doctrine, and yet our Author saith, *It is no Article of Faith with him.*

Why

Why not, ſince the Popes and Councils have as evidently delivered it, as the Council of *Trent* hath done Purgatory, or Tranſubſtantiation? But he may ſay, *There is no Anathema joined to it.* Suppoſe there be not; But why may it not be, as well as in the other Caſes? And if it were, I would know, whether in his Conſcience he would then believe it to be a neceſſary Article of Faith, thô he believed that it wanted Scripture and Tradition? If not, then he ſees what this matter is brought to, *viz.* That althô the Council of *Trent* declare theſe new Doctrines to be neceſſary to be believed; yet if their Declaration be not built on Scripture and Univerſal Tradition, we are not bound to receive it.

2. *As to the impoſſibility of Innovations coming in without notorious oppoſition,* I ſee no ground at all for it, where the alteration is not made at once, but proceeds gradually. He may as well prove it impoſſible for a Man to fall into a *Dropſy* or a *Hectick-Fever*, unleſs he can tell the punctual time when it began. And he may as well argue thus, Such a Man fell into a Fever upon a great Debauch, and the Phyſicians were preſently ſent for to adviſe about him; therefore the other Man hath no Chronical Diſtemper, becauſe he had no Phyſicians when he was firſt ſick; as becauſe Councils were called againſt ſome Hereſies, and great Oppoſition made to them, therefore where there is not the like, there can be no *Innovation.* But I ſee no Reaſon why we ſhould decline giving an Account, by what Degrees, and Steps, and upon what Occaſions, and with what Oppoſition ſeveral of the Doctrines defined at *Trent* were brought in. For the matter is not ſo obſcure as you would make it, as to moſt of the Points in difference between us. But that is too large a Task to be here undertaken.

3. There is no colour for calling in Queſtion the Articles of Faith received by us on the ſame Grounds that we reject thoſe defined by the Council of *Trent*; for we have the Univerſal Conſent of the Chriſtian World for the *Apoſtles Creed*; & of the 4 General Councils for the Doctrines of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*; who never pretended to determine any Point to be neceſſary which was not reveal'ed in Scripture; whoſe ſenſe was delivered down by the Teſtimony of the *Chriſtian Church* from the Apoſtles times. But the Council of *Trent* proceeded by a very different Rule; for it firſt ſet up *an Unwritten Word* to be a Rule of Faith, as well as *the Written*; which althô it were neceſſary in order to their Decrees, was one of the greateſt Innovations in the World; and the Foundation of all the reſt, as they were there eſtabliſhed. Seſſ. Quarta.

The

The CONCLUSION.

These are the Characters *of the* Papist, *as he is* Mis-represented, *and as* Represented. *And as different as the* One *is from the* Other, *so different is the* Papist, *as reputed by his Maligners, from the* Papist, *as to what he is in himself. The* One *is so absurd and monstrous, that 'tis impossible for any one to be of that Profession, without first laying by all thoughts of* Christianity, *and his* Reason. *The* Other *is just contradictory to this; and without any farther Apology, may be expos'd to the perusal of all prudent and unpassionate Considerers, to examine if there be any thing in it that deserves the hatred of any Christian: and if it be not in every Point wholly conform to the Doctrine of Christ, and not in the least contrary to Reason. The* Former *is a* Papist, *as he is generally apprehended by those who have a* Protestant Education; *such, as whensoever reflected on, is conceiv'd to be a perverse, malicious sort of Creature,* Superstitious, Idolatrous, Atheistical, Cruel, Bloody-minded, Barbarous, Treacherous, *and so* Prophane, *and every way* Inhumane, *that 'tis in some manner doubted, whether he be* Man *or no. The* Other *is a* Papist, *whose* Faith *is according to the Proposal of the Catholick Church; which by Christ's Command he is oblig'd to believe and hear, and whose whole design in this World is for obtaining Salvation in the next. And is it not strange, that these two Characters so directly opposite, so wholly unlike one the other, that Heaven and Hell is not more, should agree to the same person: 'Tis certainly a strange piece of Injustice, and yet not at all strange to those who know, that they that follow Christ shall be hated by the World, that those who study the Wisdom of Heaven shall have the repute of Fools; and that as many as attend the* Lamb, *shall be painted in the Livery of* Satan. *Our Fore-fathers were so before us; all the Primitive Christians, the Apostles, and even the* Lamb *himself, our Redeemer.* Calumny *ever follow'd them,* Mis representation *waited upon them; and what wonder that* Infamy *was their constant Attendance? And now if the* Orthodox Christians *have thus in all Ages had their* double Character, *one of* Justice, *exactly drawn from what they really believ'd and practis'd; the other of* Malice, *copied from them, as* Mis-represented; *'tis not at all strange to find it so now in our days, when* Calumny, Malice, Ignorance, &c. *are as powerful as ever; who, though from the beginning of the World, that is above five thousand Years, they have made it their chief business to Paint, Copy, and Represent Things and Persons; yet they never did it with so much injury, so altogether* unlikely, *as they do now to the* Papists; *there being scarce any one Point of their* Faith *and* Profession *which they do not blindly mistake, or basely disguise. The* Papists *believe 'tis convenient to pray before* Holy Images, *and give them an* inferiour *or* relative *Respect.* These *describe the* Papists *Praying to* Images, *and Worshipping them*

as

as Idols. *The* Papists *believe 'tis good to desire the Prayers of the* Saints, *and Honour them as the Friends of God.* These *paint out the* Papists *as believing* Saints *to be their* Redeemers, *and Adoring them as* Gods. *The* Papists *believe, that Christ left a Power in the Priests of his Church, to absolve all truly Penitent Sinners from their Offences.* These *Representing the* Papists *as believing, That the Priests can infallibly forgive all such as come to Confession, whether they Repent or no. The* Papists *believe there's Power in the* Supreme Pastor, *upon due Motives, of granting* Indulgences; *that is, of releasing to the Faithful such Temporal Penalties as remain due to their past Sins, already remitted as to their guilt, on condition they perform such Christian Duties as shall be assign'd them, i. e. humble themselves by Fasting, confess their Sins with a hearty Repentance, receive worthily, and give Alms to the Poor,* &c. These *make the* Papists *believe, That the Pope, for a sum of Money, can give them leave to commit what Sins they shall think fit, with a certain Pardon for all Crimes already incurr'd; and that there can be no danger of Damnation to any that can but make a large Present to* Rome *at his death. The* Papists *believe, That by the Merits of Christ, the good Works of a just Man are acceptable to God, and through his Goodness and Promise meritorious of eternal Happiness.* These *report, That the* Papists *believe they can* merit *Heaven by their own Works, without any dependance on the work of our Redemption. The* Papists *worship Christ really present in the* Sacrament, *true God and Man.* These *say they fall down to, and worship a* piece *of* Bread. Some Papists *maintain the* Deposing Power: These *will have it to be an* Article *of their* Faith; *and that they are oblig'd to't by their Religion.* Some Papists *have been* Traytors, Rebels, Conspirators *&c.* These *make these Villanies to be* Meritorious *among the* Papists, *and that 'tis the Doctrine of their Church. And thus there is scarce any one thing belonging to their Faith and Exercise of their Religion, which is not wrong'd in the describing it, and injuriously* Mis-represented. *And if any be so curious, as to desire to be satisfied how this comes about, let him but stand by any of the* Undertakers, *while they are taking the* Copy *of* Popery, *and observe their Method, and he may soon come to the bottom of the* Mystery. *He may see them seriously viewing some of her Tenets, and upon a short Consideration, immediately to fall to the making* Inferences, *and deducing* Consequences, *then down go these for so many* Articles *of* Popery. *They go on, and see other of her Tenets. and these containing* Mysteries, *such as* Reason *cannot reach to, when* Faith *is not an Assistant. they are presently follow'd with variety of* Absurdities, *and seeming* Contradictions: *And down go these to the former, for so many* Articles *of* Popery. *They pass on to others, and these being not conform to the Principles of their Education, several* Misconstructions *are presently rais'd upon them, and down go these for so many* Articles *of* Popery. *They look forward, and seeing others, in the practice of which many* Abuses *have been committed; then down go the* Abuses *for so many*

Arti-

Articles *of* Popery. *Here they turn to the* Court *of* Rome, *and as many* Disorders *and* Extravagances *as they find there, ſo many* Articles *of* Popery. *They enquire into the* Actions *and* Lives *of her* Paſtors *and* Prelates, *and as many* Vices, *as many* wicked Deſigns *they diſcover there, ſo many* Articles *of* Popery. *They examine the Behaviour of her* Profeſſors, *and whatſoever* Villanies, *whatſoever* Treaſons *and* Inhumanities, *they find committed by any that own themſelves Members of that Communion, down they all go for ſo many* Articles *of* Popery. *They hear the Reports of ſuch as have* deſerted *her* Authority, *and tho through their Extravagancies and raſhneſs they deſerve not credit even in a trifle, yet their whole* Narrative *ſhall be accepted, and all their idle* Stories *be ſumm'd up for ſo many* Articles *of* Popery. *They peruſe every ſcurrilous Pamphlet and abuſive Libel, and ſuch* ridiculous Fables *as are only fit for a Chimney-corner, they borrow thence, and ſet them down for ſo many* Articles *of* Popery. *They turn over every* Papiſh Author, *and whatſoever* light, looſe, *or* extravagant Opinions, *whatſoever* Diſcourſes *carried on either through* Flattery, Diſguſt, *or* Faction, *appear in any of them, they are all mark'd out for ſo many* Articles *of* Popery. *And by theſe and ſuch like means is finiſh'd at laſt a* compleat Draught of Popery, *in which ſhe is render'd ſo* foul, monſtrous, *and* abominable, *that there can be nothing raked from the very Sinks of* Turciſm, *nothing borrow'd from the wild* Africans, *or barbarous* Americans, *that can make her more* odious, *or add to her* deformity. *Why, and is not* Popery *then ſuch as 'tis thus generally painted? No, 'tis no more like it, than* Monarchy *is to that which turbulent* Republican *Spirits ſhew for it; when diſplaying to the multitude ſome* Miſcarriages *of* State, Frailties *in Perſons in Dignities*, Abuſes *of Government*, &c. *they cry out*, Behold this is Monarchy. *By this means making it infamous among the People, that they may more eaſily overthrow it. And are not the* Papiſts *ſuch as they are commonly* Repreſented? *No: They are no more alike than the* Chriſtians *were of old under the Perſecuting Emperors, to what they appear'd when cloathed with* Lions and Bears Skins *they were expoſed in the Amphi-theatre to* Wild Beaſts; *under thoſe* borrow'd Shapes *to provoke their* Savage Oppoſites *to greater fury; and that they might infallibly, and with more rage, be torn in pieces. Let* Monarchy *be ſhewn in its* own colours, *and the* Chriſtians *be expos'd in their* own form, *and one will have but few Maligners, and the others will meet with a more tame Behaviour, even from the* wildeſt Beaſts. *Let any but ſearch into the* Councils *of the Church of* Rome, *even that of* Trent, *than which none can be more* Popiſh; *let them peruſe her* Catechiſms, *that*, ad Parochos, *or others ſet forth for Paſtors to inſtruct their Flock, and for Children, Youth, and others to learn their Chriſtian Doctrine, of which there is extant great variety in* Engliſh: *let them examine* Vernon's Rule of Faith, *and that ſet forth by the Biſhop of* Condan: *let them look into the Spiritual Books of Direction, Thoſe of Biſhop* Sales, *the* Following of Chriſt, *the* Chriſtian Rules, *the* Spiritual Com-

Combat, Granado's Works, *and infinite others of this ſort, which Papiſts generally keep by them for their Inſtruction: And then let them freely declare whether the* Papiſts *are ſo* ill principled, *either as to their* Faith *or* Morals, *as they are generally made appear. A little diligence in this kind, with a ſerious inquiry into their converſation, their manner of Living and Dying, will eaſily diſcover, that* that *of* Beaſt, *with which they are commonly expos'd to publick, is not* theirs, *but only of the* skin, *that is thrown over them. The Papiſts own, that there are amongſt them Men of very ill Lives, and that if every corner be narrowly ſifted, there may be found great abuſes, even of the moſt ſacred things; that ſome in great Dignities have been highly vilious, and carried on wicked Deſigns; That ſome Authors maintain and publiſh very abſurd Opinions, and of ill conſequence. But theſe things are nothing of their* Religion, *they are* Imperfections *indeed, the* Crimes, *the* Scandals *of ſome in their* Communion; *but ſuch they are ſo far from being oblig'd to approve, maintain or imitate, that they wiſh with all their heart, there had been never any ſuch thing, and deſire in* theſe Points a thorough Reformation. *Thô the* Imprudences *therefore, the* Failings, *the* Extravagancies, *the* Vices, *that may be pick'd up, throughout the whole* Society *of* Papiſts, *are very numerous and great, and too too ſufficient, if drawn together, for the compoſing a moſt* Deform'd Antichriſtian-Monſter; *yet the* Popery *of the* Roman-Catholicks *is no ſuch* Monſter, *as 'tis painted. Thoſe things which are commonly brought againſt them, being as much deteſted by them, as by the Perſons that lay the charge of their diſ-favour; and having no more relation to them, than* Weeds *and* Tares *to the* Corn *amongſt which it grows; or* Chaff *to the* Wheat, *with which it lies mix'd in one heap. A* Papiſt *therefore is no more than he is above* Repreſented; *and whoſoever enters that* Communion, *has no obligation of believing otherwiſe, then as there ſpecified. And thô in each Particular, I have cited no* Authorities, *yet for the truth and exactneſs of the* Character, *I Appeal to the* Council of Trent. *And if in any Point it ſhall be found to diſagree, I again promiſe, upon notice, publickly to own it. And as for the other Part, of the* Papiſt Miſ-repreſented, *it contains ſuch Tenets as are* wrongfully *charged upon the* Papiſts; *and in as many reſpects, as it is contrary to the other* Character; *in ſo many, it is contrary to the* Faith *of their Church: And ſo far, they are ready to diſown them, and ſubſcribe to their Condemnation. And though any ſerious enquirer may be eaſily ſatisfied as to the truth of this; yet for a publick ſatisfaction, to ſhew that thoſe* Abominable Unchriſtian Doctrines *are no part of their* Beliet, *(however extravagant ſome men may be in their Opinions;) the* Papiſts *acknowledg that a* Faith *aſſenting to* ſuch Tenets, *is wholly oppoſite to the Honour of God, and Deſtructive to the* Goſpel *of Chriſt, and do publickly invoke God Almighty's Judgments upon that* Church, *which teaches either publickly or privately ſuch a* Faith. *And ſince 'tis lawful for any Chriſtian to anſwer* Amen, *to ſuch* Anathema's, *as are pronounc'd againſt things* apparently ſinful; *the* Papiſts, *to ſhew to the World*

that they diſown the following Tenets, *commonly laid at their door; do here oblige themſelves, that if the enſuing* Curſes *be added to thoſe appointed to be read on the firſt day of* Lent; *They will ſeriouſly and heartily anſwer* Amen *to them all.*

I. Curſed is he that commits Idolatry; that prays to Images or Relicks, or Worſhips them for God. R. *Amen.*

II. Curſed is every Goddeſs Worſhiper, that believes the Virgin *Mary* to be any more than a creature; that Honour her, Worſhip her, or puts his Truſt in her more than in God; that believes her above her Son, or that ſhe can in any thing command him. R. *Amen.*

III. Curſed is he that believes the Saints in Heaven to be his Redeemers, that prays to them as ſuch, or that gives God's Honour to them, or to any creature whatſoever. R. *Amen.*

IV. Curſed is he that Worſhips any Breaden God, or makes Gods of the empty Elements of Bread and Wine. R. *Amen*

V. Curſed is he that believes that Prieſts can forgive Sins whether the Sinner repent or no: Or that there's any Power in Earth or Heaven that can forgive ſins, without a hearty repentance and ſerious purpoſe of amendment. R. *Amen.*

VI. Curſed is he that believes there's Authority in the Pope or any others, that can give leave to commit ſins; Or that can forgive him his ſins for a ſum of Money. R. *Amen.*

VII. Curſed is he that believes (that Independent of the Merits and Paſſion of *Chriſt*) he can Merit Salvation by his own good Works; or make condign ſatisfaction for the guilt of his ſins, or the pains Eternal due to them. R. *Amen.*

VIII. Curſed is he that contemns the Word of God, or hides it from the People, on deſign to keep them from the knowledge of their Duty, and to preſerve them in Ignorance and Error. R. *Amen.*

IX. Curſed is he that undervalues the Word of God, or that forſaking Scripture chuſes rather to follow Humane Traditions than it. R. *Amen.*

X. Curſed is he that leaves the Commandments of God, to obſerve the conſtitutions of Men. R. *Amen.*

XI. Curſed is he that omits any of the Ten Commandments, or keeps the people from the knowledge of any one of them, to the end they may not have occaſion of diſcovering the Truth. R. *Amen.*

XII. Curſed is he that Preaches to the People in unknown Tongues, ſuch as they underſtand not; or uſes any other means to keep them in Ignorance. R. *Amen.*

XIII. Curſed is he that believes that the *Pope* can give to any, upon any account whatſoever, Diſpenſation to lie or ſwear falſly; or that 'tis lawful for any, at the laſt hour to proteſt himſelf Innocent in caſe he be Guilty. R. *Amen.*

XIV.

XIV. Curſed is he that encourages ſins, or teaches Men to defer the amendment of their Lives, or preſumption of their Death-bed-Repentance. R. *Amen.*

XV. Curſed is he that teaches Men that they may be lawfully drunk on a *Friday* or any other Faſting-day, tho they muſt not taſte the leaſt bit of Fleſh. R. *Amen.*

XVI. Curſed is he who places Religion in nothing but a pompous ſhew conſiſting only in Ceremonies; and which teaches not the People to ſerve God in Spirit and Truth. R. *Amen.*

XVII. Curſed is he who loves or promotes Cruelty, that teaches People to be bloody-minded, and to lay aſide the meekneſs of *Jeſus Chriſt.* R. *Amen.*

XVIII. Curſed is he who teaches it lawful to do any wicked thing, tho it be for the Intereſt and Good of Mother-Church: or that any Evil Action may be done that Good may come on it. R. *Amen.*

XIX. Curſed are we, if amongſt all thoſe wicked Principles and damnable Doctrines commonly laid at our doors, any one of them be the Faith of our Church: And curſed are we, if we do not as heartily deteſt all thoſe helliſh Practices as they that ſo vehemently urge them againſt us. R. *Amen.*

XX. Curſed are we, if in an anſwering, and ſaying *Amen* to any of theſe *Curſes*, we uſe any Equivocations, Mental Reſervations; or do not aſſent to them in the common and obvious Senſe of the Words. R. *Amen.*

And can the Papiſts *then, thus ſeriouſly, and without check of Conſcience, ſay* Amen *to all theſe* Curſes? *Yes they can, and are ready to it whenſoever, and and as often as it ſhall be requir'd of them. And what then is to be ſaid of thoſe who either by* Word *or* Writing, *charge theſe Doctrines upon the* Faith *of the* Church of *Rome*, Is a lying Spirit in the mouth of all the Prophets? Are they all gone aſide? Do they back-bite with their Tongue, do Evil to their Neighbour, and take up Reproach againſt their Neighbour? *I'll ſay no ſuch thing, but leave the impartial Conſiderer to judge. One thing I can ſafely affirm, That the* Papiſts *are foully* Miſ-repreſented, *and ſhew in publick as much unlike what they are, as the Chriſtians were of old by the Gentiles; that they lie under a great Calumny, and ſeverely ſmart in good Name, Perſons, and Eſtates, for ſuch things which they as much and as heartily deteſt as thoſe who accuſe them. But the Comfort is, Chriſt has ſaid to his Followers,* Ye ſhall be hated of all men, (*Matth.* 10. 22.) *and Saint* Paul, We are made a Spectacle unto the World; *and we don't doubt, that who bears this with Patience, ſhall for every loſs here, and content, receive a hundred fold in Heaven:* For baſe things of the World, and things which are deſpiſed, hath God choſen, 1 *Corinth.* 1. 28.

that they diſown the following Tenets, *commonly laid at their door*; *do here oblige themſelves, that if the enſuing* Curſes *be added to thoſe appointed to be read on the firſt day of* Lent; *They will ſeriouſly and heartily anſwer* Amen *to them all.*

I. Curſed is he that commits Idolatry; that prays to Images or Relicks, or Worſhips them for God. R. *Amen.*

II. Curſed is every Goddeſs Worſhiper, that believes the Virgin *Mary* to be any more than a creature; that Honour her, Worſhip her, or puts his Truſt in her more than in God; that believes her above her Son, or that ſhe can in any thing command him. R. *Amen.*

III. Curſed is he that believes the Saints in Heaven to be his Redeemers, that prays to them as ſuch, or that gives God's Honour to them, or to any creature whatſoever. R. *Amen.*

IV. Curſed is he that Worſhips any Breaden God, or makes Gods of the empty Elements of Bread and Wine. R. *Amen*

V. Curſed is he that believes that Prieſts can forgive Sins whether the Sinner repent or no: Or that there's any Power in Earth or Heaven that can forgive ſins, without a hearty repentance and ſerious purpoſe of amendment. R. *Amen.*

VI. Curſed is he that believes there's Authority in the Pope or any others, that can give leave to commit ſins; Or that can forgive him his ſins for a ſum of Money. R. *Amen.*

VII. Curſed is he that believes (that Independent of the Merits and Paſſion of *Chriſt*) he can Merit Salvation by his own good Works; or make condign ſatisfaction for the guilt of his ſins, or the pains Eternal due to them. R. *Amen.*

VIII. Curſed is he that contemns the Word of God, or hides it from the People, on deſign to keep them from the knowledge of their Duty, and to preſerve them in Ignorance and Error. R. *Amen.*

IX. Curſed is he that undervalues the Word of God, or that forſaking Scripture chuſes rather to follow Humane Traditions than it. R. *Amen.*

X. Curſed is he that leaves the Commandments of God, to obſerve the conſtitutions of Men. R. *Amen.*

XI. Curſed is he that omits any of the Ten Commandments, or keeps the people from the knowledge of any one of them, to the end they may not have occaſion of diſcovering the Truth. R. *Amen.*

XII. Curſed is he that Preaches to the People in unknown Tongues, ſuch as they underſtand not; or uſes any other means to keep them in Ignorance. R. *Amen.*

XIII. Curſed is he that believes that the *Pope* can give to any, upon any account whatſoever, Diſpenſation to lie or ſwear falſly; or that 'tis lawful for any, at the laſt hour to proteſt himſelf Innocent in caſe he be Guilty. R. *Amen.*

XIV.

XIV. Curſed is he that encourages ſins, or teaches Men to defer the amendment of their Lives, or preſumption of their Death-bed-Repentance. R. *Amen.*

XV. Curſed is he that teaches Men that they may be lawfully drunk on a *Friday* or any other Faſting-day, tho they muſt not taſte the leaſt bit of Fleſh. R. *Amen.*

XVI. Curſed is he who places Religion in nothing but a pompous ſhew conſiſting only in Ceremonies; and which teaches not the People to ſerve God in Spirit and Truth. R. *Amen.*

XVII. Curſed is he who loves or promotes Cruelty, that teaches People to be bloody-minded, and to lay aſide the meekneſs of *Jeſus Chriſt.* R. *Amen.*

XVIII. Curſed is he who teaches it lawful to do any wicked thing, tho it be for the Intereſt and Good of Mother-Church: or that any Evil Action may be done that Good may come on it. R. *Amen.*

XIX. Curſed are we, if amongſt all thoſe wicked Principles and damnable Doctrines commonly laid at our doors, any one of them be the Faith of our Church: And curſed are we, if we do not as heartily deteſt all thoſe helliſh Practices as they that ſo vehemently urge them againſt us. R. *Amen.*

XX. Curſed are we, if in an anſwering, and ſaying *Amen* to any of theſe *Curſes*, we uſe any Equivocations, Mental Reſervations; or do not aſſent to them in the common and obvious Senſe of the Words. R. *Amen.*

And can the Papiſts *then, thus ſeriouſly, and without check of Conſcience, ſay* Amen *to all theſe* Curſes? *Yes they can, and are ready to it whenſoever, and and as often as it ſhall be requir'd of them. And what then is to be ſaid of thoſe who either by* Word *or* Writing, *charge theſe Doctrines upon the* Faith *of the* Church of *Rome*, Is a lying Spirit in the mouth of all the Prophets? Are they all gone aſide? Do they back bite with their Tongue, do Evil to their Neighbour, and take up Reproach againſt their Neighbour? *I'll ſay no ſuch thing, but leave the impartial Conſiderer to judge. One thing I can ſafely affirm, That the* Papiſts *are foully* Miſ repreſented, *and ſhew in publick as much unlike what they are, as the Chriſtians were of old by the Gentiles; that they lie under a great Calumny, and ſeverely ſmart in good Name, Perſons, and Eſtates, for ſuch things which they as much and as heartily deteſt as thoſe who accuſe them. But the Comfort is,* Chriſt *has ſaid to his Followers,* Ye ſhall be hated of all men, (*Matth.* 10. 22.) *and Saint* Paul, We are made a Spectacle unto the World; *and we don't doubt, that who bears this with Patience, ſhall for every loſs here, and content, receive a hundred fold in Heaven:* For baſe things of the World, and things which are deſpiſed, hath God choſen, 1 *Corinth.* 1. 28.

An Anſwer to the *Concluſion.*

HAving thus gone through the ſeveral Heads which our Author complains have been ſo much *Miſrepreſented*; it is now fit to conſider what he ſaith in his *Concluſion*, which he makes to anſwer his *Introduction*, by renewing therein his doleful Complaints of their being *Miſrepreſented juſt as Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and the Primitive Chriſtians were.* I hope the former Diſcourſe hath ſhewed their Doctrines and Practices are not ſo very like thoſe of *Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and the Primitive Chriſtians*, that their Caſes ſhould be made ſo parallel: but as in his Concluſion he hath ſummed up the ſubſtance of his *Repreſentations*, ſo I ſhall therein follow his Method, only with this difference, that I ſhall in one Column ſet down his own *Repreſentations* of Popery, and in the other the Reaſons, in ſhort, why we cannot embrace them.

Wherein Popery conſiſts as repreſented by this Author.

1. IN uſing all external Acts of Adoration before Images, as *Kneeling, Praying, lifting up the Eyes, burning Candles, Incenſe* &c. Not merely to worſhip the Objects before them, but to worſhip the Images themſelves on the account of the Objects repreſented by them: or in his own Words, *Becauſe the Honour that is exhibited to them, is referred to the Prototypes which they repreſent.*

2. *In joining the Saints in Heaven together with Chriſt in Interceſſion for us, and making Prayers on Earth to them on that Account.*

Our Reaſons againſt it in the ſeveral Particulars.

1. *THou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven Image, or any likeneſs of any thing in Heaven, or Earth*, &c. *Thou ſhalt not bow down to them, nor worſhip them.* Which being the plain, clear, and expreſs Words of the Divine Law, we dare not worſhip any Images, or Repreſentations, leſt we be found Tranſgreſſors of this Law. Eſpecially ſince God herein hath declared himſelf a *Jealous God*; and annexed ſo ſevere a Sanction to it. And ſince he that made the Law is only to interpret it, all the Diſtinctions in the World can never ſatisfy a Mans Conſcience, unleſs it appear that God himſelf did either make or approve them. And if God allow the Worſhip of the thing Repreſented by the Repreſentation, he would never have forbidden that Worſhip abſolutely, which is unlawful only in a certain reſpect.

2. *We have an Advocate with the Father, Jeſus Chriſt the righteous*, 1 John 2. 1. *And one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Chriſt Jeſus*, 1 Tim. 2. 5. *For Chriſt is entered into Heaven*

it

Popery as Represented.

Our Reasons against it.

it self, now to appear in the Presence of God for us, Heb. 9: 24. And therefore we dare not make other *Intercessors in Heaven* besides him: and the distance between Heaven and us, breaks off all Communication between the Saints there, and us upon Earth; so that all Addresses to them now for their Prayers, are in a way very different from desiring others on Earth to pray for us: and if such Addresses are made in the solemn Offices of Divine Worship, they joyn the Creatures with the Creator in the Acts and Signs of Worship, which are due to God alone.

3. *In allowing more Supplications to be used to the Blessed Virgin, than to Christ*; For he denies it to be *an idle Superstition*, to repeat *Ten Ave Maria's* for one *Pater-Noster.*

3. *Call upon me in the day of Trouble, I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorifie me,* Psal. 50. 15. When we pray to *Our Father in Heaven,* as our Saviour commanded us, we do but what both Natural and Christian Religion require us to do: But when men pray to the Blessed Virgin for *Help and Protection now, and at the hour of Death,* they attribute that to her, which belongs only to God, who is our *Helper and Defender*: And altho Christ knew *the Dignity of his Mother* above all others, he never gives the least Encouragement to make such Addresses to her: And to suppose her to have a share now in the Kingdom of Christ in Heaven, as a Copartner with him is to advance a Creature to Divine Honour, and to overthrow the true Ground of Christs Exaltation to his Kingdom in Heaven, which was, His suffering on the Cross for us.

4. *In giving religious Honour and Respect to Relicks.* Such as placing them upon Altars, burning Wax-Candles before them, carrying them in Processions, to be seen, touched, or humbly kissed by the People: which are the known & allowed Practices in the Church of *Rome.*

4. *And no man knoweth of the Sepulchre of Moses unto this day,* Deut. 34. 6. Why should God hide the Body of *Moses* from the People, if he allowed *giving religious Honour and Respect to Relicks?* Why should *Hezekiah break in pieces the Brazen Serpent, because the Children of Israel did burn Incense to it?* 2 Kings 18. 4. especially when it was a Type or Representation of Christ himself, and God had wrought many Miracles by it.

5. *Whom*

Popery as Repreſented.	*Our Reaſons againſt it.*
5. *In adoring Chriſt as preſent in the Euchariſt on the account of the Subſtance of Bread and Wine being changed into that Body of Chriſt which ſuffered on the Croſs.*	5. *Whom the Heaven muſt receive until the times of the Reſtitution of all things,* Acts 3. 21. And therefore in the Euchariſt we adore him, as *ſitting on the right hand of God*; but we dare not direct our Adoration to the Conſecrated Hoſt, which we believe to be the Subſtance of Bread and Wine, (tho conſecrated to a Divine Myſtery) and therefore not a fit Object for our Adoration.
6. *In believing the Subſtance of Bread and Wine, by the Words of Conſecration, to be changed into his own Body and Blood, the Species only or Accidents of Bread and Wine remaining as before.*	6. *The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Chriſt,* 1 Cor. 10. 16. This is ſpoken of the *Bread* after Conſecration, and yet the Apoſtle ſuppoſes it to be Bread ſtill, and the *Communion of his Body* is interpreted by the next Words, *For we being many are one Bread, and one Body; for we are all Partakers of that one Bread,* v. 17. Which is very different from the Bread being changed into the very Body of Chriſt; which is an Opinion that hath no Foundation in Scripture, and is repugnant to the common Principles of Reaſon, which God hath given us, and expoſes Chriſtian Religion to the Reproach and Contempt of *Jews, Turks and Infidels.*
7. *In making good Works to be truly meritorious of Eternal Life.*	7. *When ye ſhall have done all thoſe things which are commanded you, ſay, We are unprofitable Servants, we have done that which was our Duty to do.* St. Luke 17. 10. And therefore in no ſenſe can our beſt Works be *truly meritorious of Eternal Life*: Which conſiſting in the enjoyment of God, it is impoſſible there ſhould be any juſt Proportion or due Commenſuration between our beſt Actions and ſuch a Reward.
8. *In making Confeſſion of our Sins to a Prieſt in order to Abſolution.*	8. *And the Son ſaid to him, Father I have ſinned againſt Heaven, and in thy ſight,* S. Luke 15. 21. Where Confeſſion to God is required becauſe the Offence is againſt him, but it is impoſſible for any Man upon Earth to forgive thoſe whom God doth not forgive: And he alone can appoint the neceſſary conditions of Pardon, among which true Contrition and Repentance is fully declared, but

Popery as Represented

Our Reasons against it.

but *Confession to a Priest*, thô it may be useful for the ease of the Penitent, is no where in Scripture made necessary for the Forgiveness of Sin.

9. *In the use of Indulgences for taking away the Temporal Punishments of sin remaining due after the Guilt is remitted.*

9. *I said, I will confess my Transgressions unto the Lord; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin*, Psal. 32. 5.

If God doth fully forgive the *Guilt* of sin, there remains no Obligation to Punishment; for where-ever that is, the *guilt* remains: It is true, God may not sometimes fully pardon; but he may reserve some temporal Punishment here for his own Honour, or the Chastisement of a penitent Sinner: But then what have any men to do, to pretend that they can take off what God thinks fit to lay on? Can any *Indulgences* prevent Pain or Sickness, or sudden Death? But if *Indulgences* be understood only with respect to *Canonical Penances*, they are a most notorious and inexcusable corruption of the Discipline of the Ancient Church.

10. *In supposing the Penitent Sinner may in some measure satisfie by Prayer, Fasting, Alms*, &c. *for the Temporal Pain, which by order of God's Justice sometimes remains due, after the Guilt and the Eternal Pain are remitted.*

10. *For if when we were Enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his Life*, Romans 5. 10. And therefore no Satisfaction to the Justice of God is now required from us, for the Expiation of any Remainder of Guilt. For if Christ's Satisfaction were in it self sufficient for a total Remission, and was so accepted by God, what Account then remains for the Sinner to discharge, if he perform the Conditions on his part? But we do not take away hereby the Duties of *Mortification*, *Prayer*, *Fasting*, and *Alms*, &c. but there is a difference to be made between the *Acts* of *Christian Duties*, and *Satisfaction to Divine Justice* for the Guilt of Sin, either in whole or in part. And to think to joyn any Satisfactions of ours together with Christ's, is like joyning our hand with God's in Creating or Governing the World.

11. *In thinking the Scripture not fit to be read generally by all, without Licence, or in the Vulgar Tongue.*

11. *Let the Word of Christ dwell in you richly in all Wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another*, &c. *Col.* 3. 16.

How

Popery as Repreſented.

Our Reaſons againſt it.

How could that *dwell richly in them*, which was not to be communicated to them, but with great Caution? How could *they teach and admoniſh one another* in a Language not underſtood by them? The Scriptures of the *New Teſtament* were very early perverted; and if this Reaſon were ſufficient to keep them out of the hands of the People, certainly they would never have been publiſhed for common uſe, but as prudently diſpenſed then, as ſome think it neceſſary they ſhould be now. But we eſteem it a part of our Duty, not to think our ſelves wiſer than Chriſt or his Apoſtles, nor to deprive them of that unvaluable Treaſure which our Saviour hath left to their uſe.

12. *In allowing the Books of* Tobit, Judith, Eccleſiaſticus, Wiſdom, Maccabees, *to be Canonical.*

12. *All Scripture is given by Inſpiration of God,* 2 Tim. 3. 16. *Holy men of God ſpake as they were moved by the Holy Ghoſt,* 2 Pet. 1. 21.

Therefore, where there is no Evidence of Divine Inſpiration, thoſe Books cannot be made Canonical. But the Jewiſh Church, *To whom the Oracles of God were committed,* never deliver'd theſe Books as any part of them, being written when Inſpiration was ceaſed among them. And it is impoſſible for any Church in the World to make that to be divinely inſpired, which was not ſo from the beginning.

13. *In preferring the Vulgar Latin Edition of the* Bible *before any other, and not allowing any Tranſlations into a Mother-Tongue to be ordinarily read.*

13. *But I ſay, Have they not heard? Yes verily, their ſound went into all the Earth, and their Words unto the ends of the World,* Rom. 10. 18.

Therefore the Intention of God was, that the Goſpel ſhould be underſtood by all Mankind; which it could never be, unleſs it were tranſlated into their ſeveral Languages. But ſtill the difference is to be obſerved between the Originals and Tranſlations; and no Church can make a *Tranſlation* equal to the Original. But among Tranſlations, thoſe deſerve the greateſt eſteem which are done with the greateſt Fidelity and Exactneſs. On which account, our laſt Tranſlation deſerves a more particular

Popery as Represented.

Our Reasons against it.

ticular Regard by us; as being far more useful to our People, than the *Vulgar Latin*, or any Translation made only from it.

14. *In believing that the Scripture alone can be no Rule of Faith to any private or particular Person.*

14. *Thy Word is a Lamp unto my Feet, and a Light unto my Path*, Psalm 119. 105.

Which it could never be, unless it were sufficient for necessary direction in our way to Heaven. But we suppose Persons to make use of the best means for understanding it, and to be duely qualified for following its Directions: without which, the best Rule in the World can never attain its End. And if the Scripture have all the due Properties of a Rule of Faith, it is unconceivable why it should be denied to be so; unless men find they cannot justify their Doctrines and Practices by it, and therefore are forced to make Tradition equal in Authority with it.

15. *In relying upon the Authority of the present Church for the sense of Scripture.*

15. *Wo unto you Lawyers, for ye have taken away the Key of Knowledg; ye entred not in your selves, & them that were entring in ye hindred.* S. Luk. 11. 52.

From whence it follows, that the present Guides of the Church may be so far from giving the true Sense of Scripture, that they may be the chief Means to hinder Men from right understanding it. Which argument is of greater force, because those who plead for the Infallibility of the Guides of the present Church, do urge the promises made to the Jewish Church at that time; as our Author doth from those *who sat in the Chair of* Moses, *and from* Caiaphas *his Prophesying.*

16. *In receiving and believing the Churches Traditions as the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, and assenting to them with Divine Faith, just as he doth to the* Bible.

16. *We have also a more sure word of Prophesie; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed*, 2 Pet. 1. 19.

And yet here the Apostle speaks of something delivered by the Testimony of those who were with Christ in the Holy Mount. From whence we infer, that it was not the Design of Christ to leave us to any *Vocal Testimony*, but to refer us to the *Written Word*, as the most certain Foundation of Faith. And it is not any Persons assuming the Title of the Catholick Church to themselves,

can give them Authority to impoſe any Traditions on the Faith of Chriſtians; or require them to be believed equally with the Written Word. For before any Traditions can be aſſented to with Divine Faith, the Churches Authority muſt be proved to be Divine and Infallible, either by a written or unwritten Word; but it can be done by neither, without overthrowing the neceſſity of ſuch an Infallibility in order to Divine Faith; becauſe the Teſtimony on which the Churches Infallibility is proved, muſt be received only in a way of Credibility.

17. *In believing that the preſent Guides of the Church being aſſembled in Councils for preſerving the Unity of the Church, have an Infallible Aſſiſtance in their Decrees.*

17. *Alſo of your own ſelves ſhall Men ariſe, ſpeaking perverſe things to draw away Diſciples after them,* Acts 20. 30.

Which being ſpoken of the *Guides* of the *Chriſtian Church*, without Limitation of Number, a poſſibility of Error is implied in any Aſſembly of them; unleſs there were ſome other Promiſes which did aſſure us, That in all great Aſſemblies the Spirit of God ſhall always go with the caſting Voice, or the greater Number.

18. *In believing the Pope to be the Supreme Head of the Church under Chriſt, being Succeſſor to S.* Peter *to whom he committed the care of his Flock.*

18. *And he gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and ſome Evangeliſts, and ſome Paſtors and Teachers----for the edifying of the Body of Chriſt ----till we all come in the Unity of the Faith,* &c. Epheſ. 4. 13, 14, 15.

Now here being an account given of the Officers Chriſt appointed in his Church, in order to the *Unity* and *Edification* of it, it had been unfaithfulneſs in the Apoſtle to have left out the Head of it, in caſe Chriſt had appointed any. Becauſe this were of more conſequence than all the reſt, being declared neceſſary to Salvation to be in ſubjection to him. But neither this Apoſtle, nor St. *Peter* himſelf, give the leaſt intimation of it. Which it is impoſſible to conceive ſhould have been left out in the Apoſtolical Writings upon ſo many occaſions of mentioning it, if ever Chriſt had inſtituted a Headſhip in the *Church*, & given it to S. *Peter* and his Succeſſors in the See of *Rome*. 19.

Popery as Represented.

19. *In believing that Communion in both Kinds is an indifferent thing; and was so held for the first four hundred years after Christ, and that the first Precept for Receiving under both Kinds, was given to the Faithful by Pope* Leo I. *and confirmed by Pope* Gelasius.

20. *In believing that the Doctrine of Purgatory is founded on Scripture, Authority, and Reason.*

Our Reasons against it.

19. *For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come,* 1 Cor. 15. 26.

The Apostle speaking to all Communicants, plainly shews, that the Institution of Christ was, That all should partake of both Kinds, and so to continue to do as long as this Sacrament was to shew forth the Death of Christ, *viz.* till his Second coming. And there is no colour for asserting the Christian Church ever looked on observing Christs Institution in this matter as an indifferent thing; no not for a thousand years after Christ. Altho the Practice and the Obligation are two things, yet when the Practise was so agreeable to the Institution, and continued so long in the *Church*, it is hardly possible for us to prove the sense of the Obligation, by a better way than by the continuance of the Practise. And if some Traditions must be thought binding, and far from being indifferent, which want all that Evidence which this practise carries along with it, How unreasonable is it in this Case to allow the Practise, and to deny the Obligation?

20. *And whom he justified them he also glorified,* Rom. 8. 30.

But whom God justifies, they have the Remission of their Sins as to Eternal Punishment. And if those who are thus justified, must be glorified, what place is there for Purgatory? For there is not the least intimation of any other state of Punishment that any who are justified must pass through before they are admitted to Glory. We grant they may, notwithstanding, pass through many intermediate trials in this World; but we say, where there is Justification, there is *no Condemnation*; but where any part of guilt remains unremitted, there is a Condemnation remaining so far as the punishment extends. And so this distinction as to Eternal and Temporal Pains, as it is made the Foundation of Purgatory, is wholly groundless; and therefore the Doctrine built upon it can have no Foundation in Scripture or Reason.

Popery as Repreſented.	*Our Reaſons againſt it.*
21. *In believing that to the ſaying of Prayers well and devoutly, it is not neceſſary to have attention on the Words, or on the Senſe of Prayers.*	21. *I will pray with the Spirit, and I will pray with the Underſtanding alſo,* 1 Cor. 14. 15. What need *this Praying with the Underſtanding,* if there were no neceſſity of attending to the ſenſe of Prayers? For then *praying with the Spirit* were all that was required; for that ſuppoſes *an attention of the Mind upon God.* And I can hardly believe any Man that thinks with Underſtanding, can juſtifie praying without it; eſpecially when there are Exhortations and Invitations to the People to joyn in thoſe Prayers, as it is plain there are in the *Roman* Offices.
22. *In believing that none out of the Communion of the Church of* Rome *can be ſaved; and that it is no Uncharitableneſs to think ſo.*	22. *Then* Peter *opened his mouth, and ſaid, Of a truth I perceive that God is no reſpecter of Perſons; but in every Nation, he that feareth God and worketh Righteouſneſs, is accepted with him,* Acts 10. 34, 35. Whereby we perceive, that God doth not limit the poſſibility of Salvation under the Goſpel to Communion with the See of *Rome*; for if S. *Peter* may be believed, the capacity of Salvation depends upon Mens *fearing God and working Righteouſneſs*; and it is horrible Uncharitableneſs to exclude thoſe from a poſſibility of Salvation, whom God doth not exclude from it.
23. *In believing that the Church of* Rome, *in all the new Articles defined at* Trent *hath made no Innovation in matters of Faith.*	23. *That ye ſhould earneſtly contend for the Faith which was once delivered to the Saints,* Jude *v.* 3. Therefore all neceſſary Doctrines of Faith were at firſt delivered; and whatever Articles cannot be proved to have been delivered by the Apoſtles, can never be made neceſſary to be believed in order to Salvation. Which overthrows the additional Creed of *Pius* IV. after the Council of *Trent*; and puts them upon the neceſſity of proving the Univerſal Tradition of thoſe Doctrines from the Apoſtolical Times: and when they do that, we may think better of them than at preſent we do; for as yet we can ſee neither *Scripture*, nor *Reaſon*, nor *Antiquity* for them.

Thus

THus I have *Repreſented* that kind of *Popery* which our Author, (who complains ſo much of *Miſrepreſenting*) allows; and I have in ſhort ſet down how little ground we have to be fond of it; nay, to ſpeak more plainly, it is that we can never yield to, without betraying the Truth, renouncing our Senſes and Reaſon, wounding our Conſciences, diſhonouring God and his Holy Word and Sacraments, perverting the Doctrine of the Goſpel as to Chriſt's Satisfaction, Interceſſion, and Remiſſion of Sins; depriving the People of the Means of Salvation which God himſelf hath appointed, and the Primitive Church obſerved, and damning thoſe for whom Chriſt died.

We do now in the ſincerity of our Hearts appeal to God and the World, That we have no deſign to *Miſ-repreſent* them, or to make their Doctrines and Practiſes appear worſe than they are: But take them with all the Advantages even this Author hath ſet them out with, we dare appeal to the Judgments and Conſciences of any impartial men, whether (the Scripture being allowed on both ſides) our Doctrines be not far more agreeable thereto than the *New Articles* of *Trent*, which are the very Life and Soul of Popery? Whether our Worſhip of God be not more ſuitable to the Divine Nature and Perfections, and the Manifeſtations of his Will, than the *Worſhip of Images*, and *Invocation of Fellow-Creatures?* Whether the plain Doctrine of the neceſſity of Repentance and ſincere Obedience to the Commands of Chriſt, do not tend more to promote Holineſs in the World, than the *Sacrament of Penance*, as it is delivered and allowed to be practiſed in the Church of *Rome*, *i. e.* with the *eaſineſs* and *efficacy* of *Abſolution*, and getting off the Remainders by *Indulgences*, *Satisfactions* of others, and *Prayers for the Dead*? Whether it be not more according to the Inſtitution of Chriſt to have *the Communion in both Kinds*, and to have *Prayers and the Scriptures in a Language which the People underſtand?* And laſtly, whether there be not more of *Chriſtian Charity* in believing and hoping the beſt of thoſe vaſt Bodies of Chriſtians who live out of the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, in the *Eaſtern*, *Southern*, *Weſtern*, and *Northern* Parts, than to pronounce them all uncapable of Salvation on that Account? And therefore out of regard to God and the Holy Religion of our Bleſſed Saviour; out of regard to the Salvation of our own and other Souls, we cannot but very much prefer the Communion of our own Church before that of the *Church* of *Rome*.

But before I conclude all, I muſt take ſome notice of his *Anathema's*: And here I am as much unſatisfied as in any other part of his Book, and that for theſe Reaſons.

1. Becauſe he hath no manner of Authority to make them, ſuppoſe they were meant never ſo ſincerely: And if we ſhould ever object them to any others of that Church, they would preſently ſay, *What had he to do to make*

Anathe-

Anathema's? It belongs only to the Church and the General Councils to pronounce Anathema's, and not to any private Perſon whatſoever. So that if he would have publiſhed *Anathema's* with Authority, he ought to have printed thoſe of the Council of *Trent*; *viz.* ſuch as theſe,

Curſed is he that doth not allow the Worſhip of Images.

Curſed is he that ſaith Saints are not to be Invocated.

Curſed is he that doth not believe Tranſubſtantiation, Purgatory, &c.

2. Becauſe he leaves out an *Anathema* in a very material point, *viz. As to the Depoſing Doctrine.* We do freely, and from our Hearts *Anathematize* all ſuch Doctrines as tend to diſſolve the Bonds of Allegiance to our Sovereign, on any pretence whatſoever. Why was this paſt over by him, without any kind of *Anathema?* Since he ſeems to approve the *Oxford Cenſures.* Why did he not here ſhew his zeal againſt all ſuch dangerous Doctrines? *If the Depoſing Doctrine* be falſly charged upon their Church, let us but once ſee it *Anathematized* by publick Authority of their Church, and we have done. But inſtead thereof, we find in a Book very lately publiſhed with great Approbations, by a preſent *Profeſſor* at *Lovain Fr. D'Enghien*, all the Cenſures on the other ſide cenſured and deſpiſed, and the holding the Negative as to the *Depoſing Doctrine*, is declared by him to be *Hereſie, or next to Hereſie*: The Cenſure of the *Sorban* againſt *Sanctarellus*, he ſaith, *was only done by a Faction; and that of Sixty Eight Doctors there were but Eighteen preſent; and the late Cenſure of the* Sorban, he ſaith, *was condemned by the Inquiſition at* Toledo, Jun. 10. 1683. *as erroneous and ſchiſmatical*; and ſo by the *Clergy* of *Hungary*, Oct. 24. 1682.

Auctoritas Sedis Apoſtolicæ in Reges. p. 374 408. ad 430.

P. 549.

We do not queſtion but there are Divines that oppoſe it; but we fear there are too many who do not; and we find they boaſt of their own numbers, and deſpiſe the reſt as an inconſiderable Party: This we do not *Miſrepreſent* them in, for their moſt approved Books do ſhew it.

However, we do not queſtion, but there are ſeveral Worthy and Loyal Gentlemen of that Religion, of *different Principles and Practices*; and it is pity ſuch be not diſtinguiſhed from thoſe who will not renounce a Doctrine ſo dangerous in the Conſequences of it.

3. Becauſe the *Anathema's* he hath ſet down, are not Penned ſo plainly and clearly as to give any real Satisfaction; but with ſo much Art and Sophiſtry, as if they were intended to beguile weak and unwary Readers, who ſee not into the depth of theſe things, and therefore may think he hath done great matters in his *Anathema's*, when if they be ſtrictly examined, they come to little or nothing; as,

1. *Curſed is he that commits Idolatry.* An unwary Reader would think herein he diſowned all that he accuſes of *Idolatry*; but he doth not curſe any thing as *Idolatry*, but what himſelf thinks to be ſo. So again, *Curſed is he* (not that gives Divine Worſhip to Images, but) *that prays to Images or Relicks as Gods, or Worſhips them for Gods.* So that if he doth not take the Images themſelves for Gods, he is ſafe enough from his own *Anathema.*

2. *Curſed is every Goddeſs worſhiper, i. e.* That believes the Bleſſed Virgin not to be a Creature. And ſo they eſcape all the force of this *Anathema. Curſed is he that Honours her, or puts his Truſt in her more than in God.* So that if they Honour her and truſt in her but juſt as much as in God, they are ſafe enough; *Or that believes her to be above her Son:* But no *Anathema* to ſuch as ſuppoſe her to be equal to him.

3. *Curſed is he that believes the Saints in Heaven to be his Redeemers, that prays to them as ſuch.* What if men pray to them as their *Spiritual Guardians and Protectors?* Is not this giving God's Honour to them? Doth this deſerve no *Anathema?*

4. *Curſed is he that worſhips any Breaden God, or makes Gods of the empty Elements of Bread and Wine*: viz. That ſuppoſes them to be *nothing but Bread and Wine*, and yet ſuppoſes them to be *Gods* too. Doth not this look like nonſenſe? And yet I am afraid our Author would think it a ſevere *Anathema* in this matter, to ſay, *Curſed is he who believes Nonſenſe and Contradictions.*

It will be needleſs to ſet down more, ſince I have endeavoured by clear ſtating the ſeveral Controverſies to prevent the Readers being impoſed upon by deceitful *Anathema's.* And yet after all he ſaith,

Curſed are we, if in anſwering and ſaying Amen *to any of theſe Curſes, we uſe any Equivocations or Mental Reſervations, or do not aſſent to them in the common and obvious uſe of the Words.*

But there may be no Equivocation in the very Words, and yet there may be a great one in the intention and deſign of them: There may be none in ſaying *Amen* to the Curſes ſo worded: but if he would have prevented all ſuſpicion of Equivocation, he ought to have put it thus;

Curſed are we if we have not fairly and ingenuouſly expreſſed the whole meaning of our Church as to the Points condemned in theſe Anathema's; or if we have by them deſigned to deceive the People: And then I doubt he would not ſo readily have ſaid *Amen.*

THE

The CONTENTS.

	Papist. Page.	Protestant. Page.
THE Introduction and Answer.	1	10
Of Praying to Images.	19	20
Of Worshipping Saints.	28	29
Of Addressing more Supplications to the Virgin Mary than to Christ.	36	37
Of Paying Divine Worship to Relicks.	42	43
Of the Eucharist.	46	47
Of Merits and Good Works.	57	57
Of Confession.	61	62
Of Indulgences.	65	66
Of Satisfaction.	68	69
Of Reading the Holy Scriptures.	70	71
Of Apocryphal Books.	74	75
Of the Vulgar Edition of the Bible.	77	79
Of the Scripture as a Rule of Faith.	80	81
Of the Interpretation of Scripture.	82	83
Of Tradition.	85	86
Of Councils.	87	89
Of Infallibility in the Church.	90	93
Of the Pope.	95	97
Of Dispensations.	100	102
Of the Deposing Power.	105	107
Of Communion in one Kind.	111	113
Of the Mass.	116	118
Of Purgatory.	119	122
Of Praying in an unknown Tongue.	127	129
Of the Second Commandment.	132	133
Of Mental Reservations.	134	136
Of a Death-Bed Repentance.	137	138
Of Fasting.	139	140
Of Divisions and Schisms in the Church.	142	143
Of Fryars and Nuns.	145	147
Of Wicked Principles and Practices.	148	151
Of Miracles.	153	154
Of Holy-Water.	156	158
Of Breeding up People in Ignorance.	159	161
Of the Uncharitableness of the Papists.	162	166
Of Ceremonies and Ordinances.	168	173
Of Innovations in Matters of Faith.	173	180
The Conclusion and Answer to it.	182	188

FINIS.